

PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICHIGAN

1947

Volume LXII

JUNE, 1947

Number 6

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

CONTENTS

	PAGE
ROGERS, FRANCIS MILLET.—Brazil and the Azores,	361
BINDER, JAMES.—More's 'Utopia' in English: a Note on Translation,	370
MCNEIR, WALDO F.—The Original of Ateukin in Greene's 'James IV,'	376
RUNDLE, J. U.—More about Calderón, Boursault, and Ravenscroft,	382
LANCASTER, H. C.—Still More about Calderón, Boursault, and Ravenscroft,	385
KEISTER, DON A.—The Birth Date of Lord Herbert of Cherbury,	389
BABCOCK, R. W.—Benevolence, Sensibility and Sentiment in Some Eighteenth-Century Periodicals,	394
BURNS, WAYNE.—Charles Reade and the Collinses,	397
GOING, W. T.—The Term 'Sonnet Sequence,'	400
LESLIE, J. K.—Casal's 'Salomé': the Mystery of the Missing Prophet,	402
JAMES, DAVID.—Gavarni and the Goncourts' 'Henriette Maréchal,'	405
GRUBBS, HENRY A.—Mallarmé and Bryant,	410
BISHOP, MORRIS.—Chateaubriand Did Not Meet Washington,	412
STORER, MARY E.—Bibliographical Note on Mme de Villedieu,	413
STOREE, MARY E.—Madame de Villedieu and the Academy of the Ricovrati,	418

REVIEWS:—

A. R. NYKL, Hispano-Arabic Poetry and Its Relations with the Old Provençal Troubadours. [A. F. G. Bell.]	421
B. A. MORRISSETTE, The Life and Works of Marie-Catherine Desjardins (Mme de Villedieu) 1632-83. [Mary E. Storer.]	424
CLEANTH BROOKS, The Well Wrought Urn. Studies in the Structure of Poetry. [D. A. Stauffer.]	426
A. N. WILEY, Jonathan Swift in Texas. [H. Teerink.]	429

BRIEF MENTION: The Augustan Reprint Society,	431
--	-----

CORRESPONDENCE: Bernard the Monk: Nota Amplificata,	432
---	-----

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS • BALTIMORE 18, MD.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A Monthly Publication with intermission from July to October (inclusive)

Edited by H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

WILLIAM KURRELMAYER
RAYMOND D. HAVENS
KEMP MALONE

C. S. SINGLETON
CHARLES R. ANDERSON
DON CAMERON ALLEN

Advisory Editors

E. Feise, Grace Frank, J. C. French, E. Malakis, R. B. Roulston, Pedro Salinas,
Arno Schirokauer, L. Spitzer

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume is \$5.00
for the United States and Mexico and \$5.50 for other countries
included in the Postal Union. Single issues, price seventy-five cents.

Contributors and Publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to the Editors of Modern Language Notes, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., indicating on the envelope whether the contribution concerns English, German, or Romance. Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed return envelope. In accepting articles for publication, the editors will give preference to those submitted by subscribers to the journal. Foot-notes should be numbered continuously throughout each article; titles of books and journals should be italicized; titles of articles enclosed in quotation marks. Quotation marks are not used in verse quotations that form a paragraph. Write II, 3, not vol. II, p. 3. The following abbreviations are approved: *DNB.*, *JEGP.*, *MLN.*, *MLR.*, *MP.*, *NED.*, *PMLA.*, *PQ.*, *RR.*, *SP.*, *RES.*, *TLS.* Proof and MS. should be returned to the editors with an indication of the total number of reprints desired. Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore 18, Maryland.

THE AMERICAN FOLKLORE SOCIETY, INC.

Founded 1888

JOSEPH M. CARRIÈRE, President

WAYLAND D. HAND, Editor

The Committee on Research in Folklore

ANN GAYTON, Chairman

The Committee on Research in Folklore, of the American Folklore Society, annually publishes in *The Journal of American Folklore* a list of folklore projects which are in progress. The writing of books, monographs, special studies, library research, and field collecting are included. Folklorists are requested to send information on their current activities to Herbert Halpert, 60 West Winter Street, Delaware, Ohio, before September 10.





Modern Language Notes

Volume LXII

JUNE, 1947

Number 6

BRAZIL AND THE AZORES

In 1943 Professor Paiva Boléo, of the University of Coimbra, published a study concerning the interest of the language of the lower classes to linguistic science.¹ In the appendix, in which he discussed "false Brazilianisms," he criticized certain Brazilian writers for labeling as peculiar to Brazil phonetic, morphological, and lexical characteristics of South American Portuguese which are also heard in many Lusitanian Portuguese dialects (the pronunciation of final unstressed *e* as [i], for example). He failed to emphasize, however, that these *brasileirismos* normally occur in the "standard language" of Brazil but not in the "standard language" of Portugal.²

¹ Manuel de Paiva Boléo, *O Interesse Científico da Linguagem Popular*. Lisbon: Tipografia da Editorial Império, L.º, 1943, 36 pp. This study was a reprint, with additions, of an article which appeared in the *Revista de Portugal, Série A, Língua Portuguesa*, I: 3 (Dec., 1942), 129-140.

² On p. 66 of *Brasileirismos* (see note 3) he accuses others of doing what he himself has done: ". . . É, portanto, grave defeito pôr em paralelo o português literário de Portugal com o português popular do Brasil, ou o português popular de Portugal com a linguagem corrente do Brasil. . . ."

The question of a standard language in Portugal and its former colony bears striking similarities to the parallel question in Britain and its former colony, our own United States. In both American countries the language of no one region has been recognized, as yet, as the norm for all speakers to adopt: Paulistas are to Cariocas what New Englanders are to Middle Westerners. In Portugal, however, a standard language has long been recognized, although scholars have disagreed as to the exact locality which furnished it. The first students of Portuguese phonetics, Prince Louis Lucien Bonaparte (*Transactions of the Philological Society*, 1880-1881, Part I: 1880, 23-41), Gonçalves Viana (*Romania*, XII, 29-98), and Henry Sweet (*Transactions of the Philological Society*, 1882-1883-1884, Part II: 1883, 203-237), took as their norm the language of cultured people in Lisbon.

Later in the same year Professor Paiva Boléo followed up his initial discussion of Brazilianisms with a much longer study.³ In it he censured quite severely the work of a number of Brazilian students of linguistics and developed his thesis that many so-called *brasileirismos* occur dialectically in Portugal. For support, he cited not only published works on Portuguese dialectology but also the results received from his noteworthy *inquérito lingüístico por correspondência*.⁴ He alluded several times to the pronunciation of

In later studies, Gonçalves Viana wavered between Lisbon (*Portugais*, Leipzig, 1903, p. iv) and the region between Lisbon and Coimbra (*Exposição da pronuncia normal portuguesa*, Lisbon, 1892, p. 43; *Ortografia Nacional*, Lisbon, 1904, p. 23), although this vacillation in no way affected the doctrine expounded in his series of studies.

Leite de Vasconcelos dared go so far as to write: "Le parler du bas peuple de Lisbonne est plus cultivé que celui de n'importe quelle autre localité" (*Esquisse d'une dialectologie portugaise*, Paris and Lisbon, 1901, pp. 211-212). Oliveira Guimarães, on the other hand, took the language of the "cultissima sociedade académica coimbrã" as his norm (*Fonética Portuguesa*, Coimbra, 1927, p. 32).

João da Silva Correia (*Biblos*, IX, 1-22) tried to be non-committal and concluded by taking the language of both Lisbon and Coimbra, but Lisbon first (cf. pp. 9 and 11).

Almost every layman in Portugal feels obliged to tell the foreigner that "Em Coimbra é que se fala o melhor português." I was told this all over Portugal, Madeira, and the Azores.

³ *Brasileirismos (Problemas de método)*, Coimbra: Coimbra Editora, Limitada, 1943, 91 pp. First published in volume III of *Brasilia, Revista do Instituto de Estudos Brasileiros da Faculdade de Letras de Coimbra*.

⁴ In order to make up in part for the lack of a linguistic atlas of Portugal, Professor Paiva Boléo decided that it would be worthwhile to draft a preliminary questionnaire and to take "linguistic soundings" of both continental and insular Portugal by means of correspondence as well as by personal inquiries in various regions. The questionnaire, consisting of 542 questions on vocabulary, was printed in two different booklets. The shorter, *Inquérito lingüístico organizado por Manuel de Paiva Boléo* (Coimbra, 1942, 115 pp.), contains the questionnaire itself, accompanied by a minimum of explanatory material; copies were sent to primary school teachers, parish priests, and others, in order that they might select informants, fill in the blanks, and return the information to the organizer of the project. The longer, more scholarly version, *O estudo dos dialectos e falares portugueses (Um inquérito lingüístico)* (Coimbra, 1942, 151 pp.), contains the questionnaire and also a more complete introduction and more notes and includes an explanation of the reasons for adopting the correspondence method, which had previously been used with success for an *Inquérito de Geografia regional* and an *Inquérito do habitat rural*.

In the two versions the author recognized, and rightly so, that his plan

Portuguese on the island of São Miguel in the Azores, with which he was familiar through his survey. The particular pronunciations which he selected are those claimed as Brazilianisms.

The Brazilians, he says, pronounce the diphthong written *ei* as *éi*, whereas the speakers of standard Lusitanian say *âi*.⁵ But, Professor Paiva Boléo points out, *éi* is also heard on Lusitanian territory, especially in the Azores, "pelo menos nalgumas zonas." He then quotes from a reply from Ponta Delgada, São Miguel: "O ditongo *ei* é pronunciado invariavelmente *éi* e não *âi*, qualquer que seja a posição em que se encontre . . ." (p. 24).

Again, the suppression of final *r* is not specifically Brazilian, says the author, for it occurs, among other places, on São Miguel: "No distrito de Ponta-Delgada (Açores), são freqüentes os substantivos e os verbos de tema em *a* em que se suprime o *r* final. . . . Esta pronúncia encontra-se, mais ou menos, em todo o resto da ilha de São-Miguel" (p. 26).

Attention is next called to the Brazilian *sinhá* and it is observed that "em localidades da ilha de São-Miguel se ouve, a cada passo, dizer *senhara* por *senhora*." There follows the significant question: "¿Não estará aí, pregunto eu, uma das fases anteriores do brasileiro *sinhá*?" (p. 26).⁶

The change of *lh* to *i* has been called a Brazilianism, yet, the author has learned, this change is common on São Miguel, particularly in Arrifes, where *abelha* is pronounced *abêia* (p. 27).

of a linguistic inquiry by correspondence would not be satisfactory for a study of regional pronunciations and wisely held the phonetic instructions to a minimum. No matter how enthusiastic and well-intentioned priests and local teachers may be, and in Portugal their enthusiasm for scholarly subjects is well-known, they do not have the requisite linguistic and phonetic training to make observations on pronunciation, except of a most general nature. Paiva Boléo recognized this not only in the questionnaire but also in *O Interesse Científico*.

Paiva Boléo's linguistic survey has served as the model for a similar survey now being conducted on the island of La Palma in the Canaries. Cf. Juan Régulo Pérez, *Cuestionario sobre palabras y cosas de la isla de La Palma*, La Laguna de Tenerife, 1946, 185 pp. (Universidad de La Laguna—Facultad de Filosofía y Letras—Seminario de Filología Románica).

⁵ The letter *â* represents approximately the sound of *u* in English *but*. In works on Portuguese phonetics the symbol [ɐ] is often employed.

⁶ The word *señá* is common in peninsular Spanish; cf. "la señá Frasquita" in Alarcón's *El sombrero de tres picos*.

Lastly, Professor Paiva Boléo has found on São Miguel the palatalized pronunciation of *t* before *e* and *i*, so characteristic of some regions of Brazil. At least, he has found, on São Miguel, something peculiar about the way the natives pronounce *t* and *k*. Although, from the descriptions which he quotes, it is difficult to conclude just what this something is, the author asks a second significant question: "Em vez de se atribuir *t'* africado brasileiro a influência espanhola, como por vezes se ouve (cfr. *noctem* > *noche*), não estará a origem dessa pronúncia nos Açores?" (p. 30).

In short, not content with the claims of those who allege an influence of African languages on the Portuguese of Brazil any more than with the claims of those who see an influence of native Indian languages,⁷ and although expressing doubt as to whether certain phonetic changes in Portuguese (*u* to *ü*, for instance) are cases of influence at all, but rather natural evolution,⁸ Professor Paiva Boléo assumes an Azorean influence on Brazilian, an influence which would have been brought about by the large number of Azoreans who emigrated to Brazil.⁹ He now recognizes the need of soliciting the aid of History and is duly informed by History that some Azoreans in fact did emigrate to Brazil:

Vê-se, por conseguinte, que a minha suposição de que deve ter havido influência da linguagem dos Açores nalgumas regiões do Brasil, suposição a que fui levado pelo simples confronto de particularidades lingüísticas e antes de ler qualquer livro sobre emigração açoriana, parece ser confirmada pela história da colonização. E, se digo "parece ser," e não "é confirmada," é porque estes problemas são de uma grande complexidade.¹⁰

Feeling the need of more historical facts than he was able to present in *Brasileirismos*, Professor Paiva Boléo engaged in his-

⁷ Cf. p. 43 of *Brasileirismos*: "... Observarei apenas que me parece que nas últimas dezenas de anos se tem evitado, louvavelmente, o exagero (que era também um erro) de atribuir muitos fenómenos do português do Brasil à influência das línguas indígenas, em especial o tupi, para se cair noutro exagero: o de querer explicar tudo por influência africana. . . ."

⁸ Cf. op. cit., p. 69: "... que relação haverá entre certos factos lingüísticos da mãe-pátria e factos idênticos das ilhas adjacentes, das colónias ou do Brasil,—como seja o caso do *ü* açoriano, que existe também em terras da Beira Baixa, não falando de outros a que fiz referência atrás? Trata-se de influência ou de evolução natural?" See also p. 33.

⁹ No mention is made of possible Italian, German, Syrian, and Japanese influences!

¹⁰ *Brasileirismos*, pp. 72-73.

torical research in the Arquivo Histórico Colonial in Lisbon and published the results in an article entitled *Filologia e História*.¹¹ In this study, in which he presents valuable new statistical information, as well as dates, he definitely localizes the Azorean influence within the states of Santa Catarina and Rio Grande do Sul. In his preceding work he had already begun to find out that it was to this part of Brazil that the Azoreans had emigrated.¹² In his most recent book, which I have reviewed elsewhere, Professor Paiva Boléo apparently still holds to his theory.¹³

Before discussing the evidence on which this theory is based, I should like to point out that, in my opinion, an Azorean influence on the language of Brazil, or, at least, on its pronunciation, is *a priori* unlikely. As a result of my visit to Brazil in 1941, when I listened to the pronunciation of the language in Belém, Recife, Baía, Rio de Janeiro, Santos, São Paulo, Campinas, Curitiba, Florianopolis, Porto Alegre, Pelotas, and finally Rio Grande, I was led to the conclusion I had formed after studying the pronunciation of the Madeiran and Azorean dialects,¹⁴ namely, that all phonetic changes noted were in keeping with the general phonetic tendencies of the Portuguese language, and, perhaps more broadly, of the Romance languages as a whole. Even admitting the role of ethnic influences on pronunciation, if one does not believe in the influence of African or American Indian languages on Brazilian, how can one believe in the influence of a relatively small group of emigrants from the Azores?^{14a}

¹¹ *Filologia e História, A emigração açoriana para o Brasil (Com documentos inéditos)*, Coimbra: Edição da Casa do Castelo, Editora, 1945, 44 pp. First published in volume XX (1944) of *Biblos, Revista da Faculdade de Letras da Universidade de Coimbra*.

¹² Concerning the Azorean emigration to Brazil, cf. Dutra Faria, "O Homem e a paisagem nos Açores," *Atlântico*, III (1943), 167-168, and Luís da Silva Ribeiro, "O P.º António Vieira e os colonos ilhéus no Brasil," *Boletim do Instituto Histórico da Ilha Terceira*, II (1944), 299. The latter article concerns the 100 families who migrated to Brazil from Santa Maria in 1647 and 1648.

¹³ Cf. pp. 8 and 42 of *Introdução ao estudo da Filologia Portuguesa* (Lisbon, 1946), reviewed in *Hispania*, XXIX (1946), 613-627.

¹⁴ Cf. "Insular Portuguese Pronunciation: Madeira," *Hispanic Review*, XIV (1946), 235-253, reviewed by Eduardo Antonio Pestana in *Revista Portuguesa de Filologia* (see note 16), I, 223-228.

^{14a} Robert C. Smith has suggested that there may be an Azorean or Madeiran influence on the architecture of Brazil. Cf. p. 126 of "Recent

Professor Paiva Boléo is well aware that his theory is founded on insufficient data. Ideally, one should have phonetic treatises on the standard languages of Portugal and Brazil as points of departure. We do not even have such basic works as these. Next, one should have a dialectal survey, or linguistic atlas, of both continental and insular Portugal, of the Portuguese colonies, and of Brazil. Although the need has been expressed many times, we have no such surveys, with the exception of the recent attempt carried out in Portugal through the mails.¹⁵ Lastly, one requires a complete historical study of the Portuguese emigration to Brazil, from Madeira as well as the several Azorean islands, including the proportion of emigrants from each of the eleven Adjacent Islands and the regions in Brazil in which they settled. Professor Paiva Boléo's historical research is evidence that such data are not available.

The most serious weakness in the theory is the use of the phonetic results of the "linguistic inquiry by correspondence." This preliminary survey was directed primarily at vocabulary, on which, within limits, intelligent priests and teachers can report. Yet the theory is based on pronunciations reported, pronunciations heard primarily on São Miguel. Moreover, not only were all the results from all areas of continental and insular Portugal not collated and studied before the theory was announced,¹⁶ but some of the results

Publications on the Fine Arts of Portugal and Brazil," *The Art Bulletin*, XXVI, 124-128.

¹⁵ The need for an atlas of Brazil has been expressed by Rebêlo Gonçalves on p. 314 of an article entitled "Instituto de Filologia—Considerações sobre a criação de um Centro de Estudos Filológicos na Universidade de S. Paulo," *Revista da Faculdade de Letras da Universidade de Lisboa*, IV (1937), 302-319, and by Antenor Nascentes on p. 65 of his *Estudos filológicos (1.ª Serie)* (Rio de Janeiro, 1939).

¹⁶ It is recognized that it will be a long while before the mass of information from the nearly two thousand replies can be studied. Indeed, Professor Paiva Boléo is having students at Coimbra work on this material at the present time. Moreover, he has already issued a printed map of Portugal, dated 1944, showing the places from which he received replies from his *inquérito*, a mimeographed *Lista das povoações inscritas no Mapa* (13 pp.) to accompany the map, and a mimeographed *BIBLIOGRAFIA sobre inquéritos e atlas lingüísticos* (dated April 8, 1944; 7 pp.).

Among the first scholarly fruits which the linguistic inquiry has borne is an article by Karl Jaberg entitled "Géographie linguistique et expressionisme phonétique: Les noms de la balançoire en portugais (Avec une carte)," published in the new Portuguese journal of which Professor Paiva

studied were not examined in the light of already published material. If the pronunciation on the other islands had been investigated, even more phonetic phenomena similar to what is heard in Brazilian Portuguese would have been noted, as, for instance, the pronunciation of *cem* as *sēi* on São Jorge, the pronunciation of *s* as a true *s* in *festa* on Fayal, and the pronunciation of *mas* with a semi-vowel *i* inserted between the stressed vowel and the final *s*, also on Fayal. All of these I noted in isolated occurrences during my own preliminary phonetic survey of the islands.

I have suggested that the descriptions of the *t* received from São Miguel are hardly trustworthy enough to serve as the basis for a theory.¹⁷ Even if we assume, however, that the palatalized Brazilian *t* is heard on the island, is the area in which the Azoreans settled in Brazil the area of the palatalized *t* and *d* of *leite* and *cidade*? From my own limited observations I am inclined to believe that it is not. Moreover, the palatalized *t* is *not* common on São Miguel or on any other island of insular Portugal.

As for the other São Miguel pronunciations cited by Professor Paiva Boléo, I agree that the change of *lh* to *i* occurs, although it is by no means widespread. I am sceptical about the suppression of final *r*, for untrained observers might not detect the presence of a voiceless final *r*. My own conclusion about written *ei* is that it is generally pronounced *ê*, although *éi* is often heard.¹⁸ Lastly, I have reservations about *sinhara* for *senhora*, for *ó* normally tends in the direction of *ô*, not *á*, on the Ilha Verde.¹⁹

Boléo is editor: *Revista Portuguesa de Filologia*, Coimbra, Vol. I, tome I (1946). The reprint, with an "Aditamento ao artigo anterior" by Paiva Boléo, contains 58 pp.

¹⁷ In the second article of my series, "Insular Portuguese Pronunciation: Porto Santo and Eastern Azores," to appear in the *Hispanic Review*, I discuss Santa Maria and São Miguel. In the third, "Insular Portuguese Pronunciation: Central and Western Azores," I discuss the remaining seven islands of the Azores group. In these articles I take full cognizance of all information hitherto published on the subject which is known to me. Suffice to point out here that the São Miguel *t* has been discussed by Gonçalves Viana in *Revista Lusitana*, I, 226, and on p. 21 of his *Exposição da pronúncia normal portuguesa*, by Leite de Vasconcelos in *RL*, I, 116, in *RL*, II, 306, and in § 88 of his *Esquisse d'une dialectologie portugaise*, and by Lygia Mattos on p. 66 of her *Ilha de São Miguel* (Ponta Delgada [1937]).

¹⁸ The following writers also believe *ei* is *ê* on the island: Gonçalves Viana (*RL*, I, 224), Leite de Vasconcelos (*RL*, II, 294; *Esquisse*, § 88; *Mês de Sonho*, Lisbon, 1926, p. 37), and Lygia Mattos (*op. cit.*, p. 66).

¹⁹ Lygia Mattos gives *senhô* for *senhor* (p. 66).

To summarize, I do not believe that the phonetic observations made on São Miguel as a result of the linguistic inquiry and quoted in *Brasileirismos* are sufficiently accurate to justify the conclusion that has been drawn. Nor is the assumption justified that, because pronunciations are heard on São Miguel in the twentieth century which bear a resemblance to certain contemporary Brazilian phonetic phenomena, these island pronunciations were the same during the period from the beginning of the seventeenth century to the nineteenth century, the period of the Azorean emigration to Brazil. Moreover, if characteristically Brazilian pronunciations had been reported in the Azores by phonetically trained observers, Professor Paiva Boléo might well have drawn a conclusion diametrically opposed to that discussed above, namely, the influence of Brazilian Portuguese on the language of the Azores.²⁰ Indeed, the marriage of Philology and History should have given rise to a second child, whose general features might have been divined from a glance at the 1930 census figures. The Azoreans, and also the Madeirans, were great emigrants; they emigrated chiefly to Brazil and to the United States. Large numbers of them, however, and here is what Professor Paiva Boléo failed to note, returned to their native islands, to the extent that, in 1930, 210 Brazilians were reported in the Madeiran archipelago and 552 in the Azores. In the same census 201 Americans were listed in the Madeiran islands and 1,089 in the Azores.²¹

The many Azoreans and Madeirans who emigrated to the United States and returned introduced a large number of English words into the insular Portuguese vocabulary, as, for instance, *bossa* (boss), *réque* (rake), and *Seriol* (City Hall), but they influenced the insular Portuguese pronunciation apparently not at all. The influence exerted on the vocabulary by the Azoreans who returned from Brazil was similar:

²⁰ A hint concerning this influence may be found in a foot-note on p. 72 of *Brasileirismos*: "O inverso, assim como a influência, nos Açores, dos dialectos crioulos, nos quais se verificam alguns fenómenos idênticos, não é tão fácil de dar-se nem de provar-se."

²¹ Figures taken from *Censo da população de Portugal, Dezembro de 1930, 7.º Recenseamento Geral da População*, vol. 1, Lisbon: Imprensa Nacional, 1933, p. 256. The figures on the Azores have been quoted in Luís da Silva Ribeiro's article "Formação histórica do povo dos Açores," published recently in *Açoreana* (cf. p. 12 of the offprint).

Fenómeno semelhante ao que se dá hoje com os anglicismos se deu anteriormente com os brasilianismos, quando a corrente emigratória insular se dirigia de preferência ao Brasil. Também os *brasileiros* gostavam de inutilmente recorrer a êles e alguns o povo adoptou; mas, passados poucos anos após o desvio da emigração para os Estados Unidos, foram esquecendo, e agora só raros se ouvem a um número muito limitado de pessoas.²²

This Brazilian influence on the Azorean vocabulary has been discussed elsewhere in print. In *O emigrante açoreano*,²³ Dr. Silva Ribeiro mentions the Brazilian expression *fazer sanzola*, in the sense of futile conversation, as having been current at the turn of the century but no longer used in 1940. In a list of nicknames current on Terceira we find the word *Maranhão* with the explanation: "Um 'maranho' é uma pessoa mal trajosa. Deve ser porém alguncha geográfica, da emigração para o Brasil."²⁴ Furthermore, a possible Brazilian influence on the Azorean folksong has been admitted:

A canção popular parece ter sofrido influência brasileira. Alguns pretendem que as comuns ao Brasil e aos Açores foram dêstes para aquêle, mas mais provável se afigura o contrário. Se dos Açores tivessem ido, não seria necessário substituir a letra, como sucede com aquelas cujo assunto, por excessivamente regional, não pode ser compreendido nas ilhas. Os nomes dalgumas canções açorianas são brasileiros, como *fôfa*, *charamba*, *lundum*, e a melodia oferece, às vezes, certas modulações, que muito se assemelham às das canções sul-americanas.²⁵

Whatever may have been the influence in the past of the Azoreans who had emigrated to Brazil, and then returned, on the vocabulary and popular songs of the "Western Islands," I should be very

²² Pp. 132-133 of Luís da Silva Ribeiro's article "Americanismos na linguagem popular dos Açores," *Portucale*, XIV (1941), 131-133.

²³ Ponta Delgada, 1940, p. 26.

²⁴ P. 206 of Capitão Frederico Lopes, Jr., "O abrazão, espelho satírico do povo terceirense," *Boletim do Instituto Histórico da Ilha Terceira*, II (1944), 188-214.

²⁵ *O emigrante açoreano*, pp. 27-28. In a letter dated August 17, 1946, Dr. Luís da Silva Ribeiro wrote me as follows: "Leituras recentes tem-me revelado que foi muito mais importante do que entre nós se julga, o papel dos açorianos na colonização de quasi todo o Brasil. No que respeita a tradições e usanças, sobretudo canções, se algumas foram de cá para lá, outras suspeito que teriam vindo do Brasil. . . . Quando era pequeno circulavam na linguagem popular flagrantes brasillianismos que já esqueceram. Sucedia mesmo dizerem-me em casa, quando inconscientemente repetia certas palavras: 'O menino não diga isso; os brasileiros é que falam assim.'"

reluctant to admit a general Brazilian influence on the insular Portuguese pronunciation. I should view characteristically Brazilian pronunciations either as the result of a spontaneous phonetic evolution which paralleled that of the language of Brazil or, if they are known to be very restricted in extent, as the local influence, within his family or immediate community, of a returned *brasileiro*.²⁶

FRANCIS MILLET ROGERS

Harvard University

MORE'S UTOPIA IN ENGLISH: A NOTE ON TRANSLATION

The portraitist wants to duplicate men, the translator wants to duplicate writings. Neither succeeds if he adds or removes or changes, for he becomes one who makes or destroys, not one who reproduces. Reasonable men assume that no portraitist or translator will ever succeed completely.

Saint Thomas More's *Utopia* was translated in 1551 by Ralph Robinson, a needy scholar become clerk to Wm. Cecil. His important labor deserves looking at because the *Utopia* did and still does reach the English-speaking public mainly via the Robinson detour.

A company of writers¹ has conned and appraised the seachange which during the Renaissance overtook non-English works on their being introduced into the mother-tongue. These writers say proper things, and well enough has been written on the subject. Translators are dangerous persons, however, and issuance of whilom warnings to that effect can be salutary. Not that readers of translations

²⁶ In 1940 I wrote, on p. 465 of my unpublished doctoral dissertation: ". . . I wonder if the occurrence of (é) in Saint Michael's isn't the peculiarity of some returned emigrant to Brazil. . ." I repeated this opinion on p. 478, where I discussed the pronunciation of *Maria* as *Mària*, which I was told was characteristic in Bretanha. In their endeavor to see a French influence in the pronunciation of this region, the São-Miguelians naturally concluded that the fully opened *a* in the first syllable was due to the French *Marie*.

¹ In addition to the *Tudor Translations* prefacers, Charles Whibley again, *CHEL*, iv, Ch. i; F. O. Matthiessen, *Translation: an Elizabethan Art* (Cambridge, Mass., 1931); and latterly Douglas Bush, *English Literature in the Earlier Seventeenth Century* (Oxford, 1946), Ch. ii.

are not equally dangerous, because they are—in letting down their guard too soon.

One peculiarity of the English *Utopia* illustrates pretty well how a translator can go wrong through insufficient conscious realization of the meanings with which his text happens to be saturated.

Everyone is interested in what Plato does with poets in the *Republic*. His treatment of them engulfs him in the same radical conflict between the body and the soul, between the esthetic-sensuous and intellectual-spiritual awareness of experience that still plagues Western men. Readers at present who turn the pages of *Utopia*, having this ordinary interest (of course besides many others) are curious to learn how its Modern English Catholic Humanist author has dealt with the eternal dilemma, and how the position he takes is given embodiment in what he conjured up for the lessoning of a naughty Christian Europe—a laudable kind of imaginary commonwealth, good certainly, whether perfect or not, in essence Greco-Roman-Christian, officially and superficially exotic-heathen. They want to know in both abstract and concrete terms what it was, the good kind of life English Catholic-Christian Humanism, through More, held out for the captivation of the sixteenth and all centuries.

For theory, there is first of all the long and familiar passage, put into Hythlodaye's mouth, describing the life-ideal of the Utopians, *voluptas*, of which there are two sorts. The first and higher, spiritual pleasure, is recognizable as *ēpōs*, a striving after union with The Divine. The subordinate second one, freely recommended, is corporal pleasure, described positively as delight through the senses, and feelings of healthy well-being, negatively as pleasure "whereof cummeth no harme" ("ex quo nihil sequatur incommodi"). The possibility of excess in pursuit of the first is not mentioned, but indulgence in the next, as just noted, is explicitly bounded. The Utopian may enjoy within measure the gratifications of earthly life while he is alive (*σωφροσύνη*), but he believes in God and immortality and knows the life of the spirit to be paramount.

Unfortunately for the searcher into the ways of More's thinking, he did not write in a vacuum. Behind the Utopian isle looms sixteenth-century Europe. This, as well as their greater importance, helps to explain why the *animi voluptates* are fulsomely dwelt on while the corporal ones are given only a lick and a promise. Europe was putting the emphasis the other way. It may explain too why description of the external culture of Utopia is so sketchy, at times

only half-conscious and indifferent. As a protester, More had what he disapproved of more on his mind than what he liked. If anybody wants to discover the exact nature of external culture in Utopia, he must scratch around.

On the subject of decorativeness and decorative art, as well as on art itself, More is obscure. He does not say whether any artists exist in Utopia. Enumerating the occupations of the people in time of peace, exclusive of holy men, scholars, and officials, Hythlodaye says:

Besides husbandry, which (as I sayde) is common to them all, euery one of them learneth one or other seuerall and particular science, as hys own proper crafte. That is most commonly other clotheworkinge in wolle or flaxe, or masonrie, or the smythes crafte, or the carpentes seyence. For there is none other occupacyon that anye nombre to speke of doth vse there (139-40).²

Is the artist hidden in the craftsman, or in the last sentence of the above quotation? Is More thinking of him, or a certain type of him, when Hythlodaye refers to "vayne and superfluous occupations . . . for ryotous superfluyte and vn honest pleasure" "where money beareth all ye swing (146)"? Regarding the result of the artist's activity, has he it or a certain type of it in mind when a little later it is stated that products of work should be "requysyte other for necessytie, or for commodytye; yea, or for pleasure, so that the same pleasure be trewe and naturall (147)"? Who knows? To relieve bafflement, all one can do is recall the direct attacks on finery, of which there are enough. There is an extended onslaught against gold and silver, jewels, fine stuffs, and color in the long passage leading up to and including the account of the Anemolian ambassador's visit (173-83), as well as a general declaration of principle earlier:

Certeynly, in all kyndes of lyuynge creatures, other fere of lacke doth cause couetousnes and rauyne, or in man only pryd; whiche counteth it a gloryouse thyng to passe and excell other in the superfluous and vayne ostentacion of thynges. The whyche kynde of vice amonge the Vtopians can haue no place (157).

Or without getting much satisfaction, he can look around Utopia itself. Music there is, "No supper is passed without musicke (166)" (but where does it come from?), and it is in the churches

² Nos. in parentheses refer to pages in J. H. Lupton, *The Utopia of Sir Thomas More* (Oxford, 1895).

too, "they sing prayses vnto God, whiche they intermixt with instrumentes of musick (295)"; but poetry, painting, sculpture, or dancing will be looked for in vain. Architecture of a sort and municipal design there had to be, because there were buildings and towns, but it is discouraging to be told merely that "As for their Cyties, he that knoweth one of them knoweth them all (126)," and that "they be all set and situate a lyke [eadem ubique], as farfurth as the place or plotte suffereth (119)." For the rest, he must be contented with such abstract attributives as "spatiosas omnes ac magnificas (119)" (applied to the cities), "egregia" and "operosa modo (289)" (to the churches), "descriptae commode (130)" (to the streets), "nec ad oculum indecora (140)" (to clothing).

There are a few references, provokingly offhand and equivocal, to an ordinary esthetic-sensual appreciation of everyday life. Overfastidiousness is scorned. More has only contempt for the well-off men in his own England "of so nyce and soo delycate a mynde (149)" that they disdain perfectly good houses that do not quite suit them. But there is also normal disgust for filth and menial work with filth. The most repellent work is delegated to criminals. (Inconsistently, the market-place in Amaurote is flushed for a practical reason only, "least the ayre, by the stenche thereof infected and corrupte, shoulde cause pestilente diseases (158).") Between these two extremes of over-fastidiousness and hyper-insensibility there is middle ground. The Utopians are not puritanical, they have wine and mead besides "cleane" water, and, of course, their backyard gardens, from which they derive, besides pleasure, profit and personal pride. More does not, it will be noticed, subsume this particular pride under "vayne ostentacion," and there is no mistaking an enthusiastic tone, even more in the Latin than in the English, when gardening is mentioned: "Hos hortos magnifacint. in his uineas, fructus, herbas, flores, habent, tanto nitore cultuque, ut nihil fructuosius usquam uiderim, nihil elegantius (131)." There is and is not uniformity of clothing. All wear the same, but in some way, one does not know exactly how, the sexes and married and unmarried persons are distinguished. At least no opportunity is given for pleasure in the wearing of garments various in color and design. Esthetically they are only "nec ad oculum indecora." They are plain and uniform, of wool without dye. Only their cleanliness is esteemed, and the fineness of thread, as in all cloth, goes ignored. But here again, in that most odd way almost reminiscent

of the small boy at the cookie-jar, hungry but apprehensive of consequences, there are the minute concessions: work-clothing is not worn in public except under a cloak, and the whiteness of linen, it appears, "ys regardede (151)." In another place, during the attack on gold and silver, when decorative objects made from them are objected to (because men, delighting in them, are reluctant to melt them down for use as tender), household ware of the Utopians is mentioned in contrast, but scarcely as a pure-utilitarian alternative: "in fictilibus e terra uitroque, elegantissimis³ . . . edant bibantque (175)." The interiors of the churches are "subobscura (290)" and contain no eikons (291), and the congregations dress in sober white, all in the same way, but the priests, for no given reason, are vested in parti-colored robes, interwoven with the feathers of birds (294).

What does Robinson do in the face of this delicately poised revelation of More's approach to human living? This much. He throws it off balance. By licence of translation at key points he changes the Utopian *civic architecture* from what it is, a dim, vague, abstractified, unattended reflection of Tudor London, fetched out of the penumbra of More's consciousness, and renders it up as, remembering everything else, one knows More would never have had it, gothically elaborate and splendiferous. All with a few words.

The range of distortion extends from down-toning to extravagant coloring. "Insula ciuitates habet quatuor et quinquaginta, spatisas omnes ac magnificas" is made "There be in the Ilande .l.iiii. large and faire cities or shiere townes (119)," the only instance of down-toning. There is naturally no attempt to fancy up the farmsteads, which, "commode dispositas," are in English "wel appointed and furnyshed (120)." He beautifies, however, with no justification at all, the tower which stands at the mouth of the bay. "turrim" in the text becomes "*a faire and a strong towre* (117)." As much heightening is added in another place: "The stretes be appoynted and set forth *verye commodious and handsome*, both for carriage and also agaynst the wyndes" is got from "Plateae cum ad uecturam, tum aduersus uentos, descriptae commode (129-30)"; but these are tame. Real exuberance is shown when the following: "Nam totam hanc urbis figuram, iam inde ab initio descriptam ab, ipso Vtopo ferunt. Sed *ornatum, caeterumque cultum . . .*" is put beside this: "For they say that king Vtopus himself, euen at the

³ Italics mine throughout.

first begenning, appointed and drew furth the platte fourme of the city into his fasion and figure that it hath nowe; but *the gallaunt garnishing, and the bewtiful setting furth of it . . . (131-2).*"

Robinson's favorite extravagantising word is *gorgeous*. There are ten instances of it. The dress of the Anemolian ambassadors is so described three times in the English. "At Anemolii . . . decreuerunt *apparatus elegantia deos quosdam reprezentare, et miserorum oculos Vtopiensum ornatus sui splendore praestringere*" is turned to "But the Anemolians . . . determined in the gorgiousnes of their apparel to represent very goddes, and *wyth the bright shynynge and glisteringe of their gaye clothinge to dasell* the eyes of the silie poore vtopains (178)"; "totus ille *splendor apparatus*" is turned to "al that gorgousnes of apparrel (179)"; "*omnem illum cultum*" is turned to "all that *gorgyouse arraye* (181)." The word is used three times miscellaneously. "*mundi huius uisendam machinam*" emerges as "the *maruelous and gorgious frame of the worlde* (218)," "*suis explicatis opibus*" as "by *gorgiouly setting furthe her [Pride's] riches* (306)," and "in templo diuiae Mariae, quod et *opere pulcherrimum, et . . .*" as "in our ladies churche, whyche is *the fayrest, the moste gorgious and curyous churche of buyldyng* in all the cytē . . . (25)." These uses are innocuous, they merely heighten what is represented as truly splendid, but they serve to prepare for four uses of the word in connection with Amaurote's *décor*:

1. "Vrbs aduersae fluminis ripae . . . *egregie arcuato ponte, commissa est*" becomes "There goeth a brydge ouer the ryuer . . . with *gorgious and substanciall arches* (128)";
2. "*aedificia neutiquam sordida*" becomes "The houses *be of fayre and gorgious buyldyng* (130)";
3. "*At nunc omnis domus uisenda forma tabulatorum trium*" becomes "But nowe the houses *be curiously builded, after a gorgiouse and gallaunt sort*, with .iii. storries one ouer another (132)";
4. "*Delubra uisuntur egregia . . . operosa modo*" becomes "Their churches *be very gorgyous . . . of fyne and curious workmanship* (289-90)."

This, when the essence of the Utopian life is its bareness, its simplicity, its austerity. Utopians live almost according to a *regula*, and indeed if it were not for explicit mitigating features, their community might almost be described without qualification as a sort of mammoth lay monastery relieved of the obligation to mortify. By taking liberties, Robinson disturbs the purity of this conception.

His behavior invites imaginative questioning. What does it mean that so many of his alterations are alike? Did he make them knowingly, half-knowingly, or unknowingly? What is their *τέλος*? The answer to the first question is perhaps easy. What he did looks like a rebellion against undecoratedness, plainness, homeliness even. The second is more difficult. When there is room for doubt, who will venture, today of all days, to distinguish confidently between the workings of the conscious and the unconscious? Resolution of the third, of course, bristles with even more peril. His individual taste may have been the cause, a taste that may have been awakened or fanned by exposure to the high coloring of prose romances. Then too, he was a poor man, and the poor do not yearn after austere paradises, whether celestial or mundane. Bemused with Amaurote, and finding it a little dull, he may have wanted to brighten it up a bit. Or he may have in London developed an admiration for courtly splendor. More obviously hated it, because of what it symbolized, but that does not mean his translator had to, even while he was translating diatribes against it. There is no evidence that he was a careful student of More's ideas, and the implications of all that More had to say may very well have escaped him. He was also an Englishman of the sixteenth century. Perhaps again, as must be recognized possible, his pen moved in response to the eddying of a time-spirit which need not here be further specified.

What can be said certainly? At least this: that to use the word *gorgeous* in describing anything Utopian is to violate fundamentally the whole tenor of a great man's mind.

JAMES BINDER

Baltimore

THE ORIGINAL OF ATEUKIN IN GREENE'S *JAMES IV*

It was pointed out a good while ago that the plot of Greene's *James IV*, c. 1591, far from being based on history, is based on the story of Astazio and Arrenopia in the first *novella* of the third decade of Giraldi Cinthio's *Hacatomithi*.¹ The glaring departure of the

¹ P. A. Daniel, "Greene and Cintio," *Athenaeum*, Oct. 8, 1881, p. 465. This discovery was independently confirmed by Wilhelm Creizenach, "Zu Greene's *James the Fourth*," *Anglia*, VIII (1885), 419-23. The *novella* source is undoubtedly correct, although a lost play with the suggestive title

play from historical facts has been widely noted,² one of its editors remarking with some asperity, "Beyond the fact that James IV of Scotland was famous for his gallantries, and that he married, not Dorothea, but Margaret the daughter of Henry VII, the play has absolutely no relation at all to that king, or to the events of his reign."³

The Italian source and Greene's characteristic distortion of history may be granted.⁴ But one important figure in the drama does not appear in the *novella* of Cinthio,⁵ for Ateukin is Greene's own creation.⁶ It seems to me that the portrayal of this character, who is variously regarded as a type of the parasite and flatterer,⁷ or a type of the Machiavellian villain,⁸ may have been influenced by the tradition of a curious charlatan whose relations with James IV of Scotland resembled the relations of Ateukin with James IV in Greene's unhistorical history play.

A Tragedie of the Kinge of Scots was presented at court in the season 1567/68; see Albert Feuillerat, ed., *Documents Relating to the Office of the Revels in the Time of Queen Elizabeth* (Louvain, 1908), p. 116.

² Alexander Dyce, ed., *Dramatic Works of Robert Greene* (London, 1831), I, xlili; J. A. Symonds, *Shakspere's Predecessors* (London, 1884), p. 559; A. W. Ward, *History of English Dramatic Literature to the Death of Queen Anne* (London, 1899, rev. ed.), I, 220; Felix E. Schelling, *Elizabethan Drama* (Boston, 1908), I, 244; A. E. H. Swaen, ed., *The Scottish History of James the Fourth* (Malone Society Reprints, 1921), p. vi.

³ J. Churton Collins, ed., *Plays and Poems of Robert Greene* (Oxford, 1905), II, 80. Indeed, the play appears to bear so little relation to the events of James IV's reign (1488-1513) that a topical significance has been seen in it because of the parallels between the dramatic character of Greene's James IV and the historical character of James VI; see Ruth Hudson, "Greene's *James IV* and Contemporary Allusions to Scotland," *PMLA*, XLVII (1932), 652-67.

⁴ The historical persons in his plays—Alphonsus V of Aragon and I of Naples, Amurath II, Roger Bacon, Prince Edward Plantagenet, Henry III, and Frederick II—cannot be regarded as historical characters in the same sense, for example, as Marlowe's Edward II or Shakespeare's Henry V.

⁵ Giovanni Battista Giraldi Cintio, *Gli Ecatommi* (Firenze, 1834), pp. 154-59, *passim*. The cruel Captain who acts under Astazio's orders in the attempt to assassinate the Queen does not correspond to Ateukin, but to the French bravo Jacques.

⁶ Collins, ed., *op. cit.*, II, 84, says "to relieve [James] of part of the burden of infamy, he creates Ateukin to originate and prompt the murder."

⁷ Symonds, *op. cit.*, p. 560; Wilhelm Creizenach, *English Drama in the Age of Shakespeare* (London, 1916), pp. 294, 305.

⁸ Frederick S. Boas, *Shakspere and his Predecessors* (London, 1940, 7th impression), p. 81; *Introduction to Tudor Drama* (Oxford, 1933), p. 165.

For a good many years there was at the court of James IV an Italian adventurer named John Damian, who first ingratiated himself with the king by his pretense of skill as a surgeon and apothecary, and then continued to abuse the king's confidence by practicing alchemy and astrology. James had an extravagant weakness for such occult arts,⁹ and the accounts of the royal treasury record frequent payments to this "arch-impostor."¹⁰ "The king would neither set bounds to his expense," says Buchanan, "nor wanted flatterers—the perpetual bane of a court—who encouraged his profusion."¹¹ In 1503 James made his favorite Abbot of Tungland.¹² In 1507 the abbot-alchemist-astrologer promised a miracle by announcing that he would fly from the wall of Stirling Castle using a set of feathered wings, an attempt in which he took an ignominious fall while the king and his court watched with interest. Dunbar wrote a satirical poem, "Of the Fenzeit Frier of Tungland," on the subject of this new fraud of the foreign quack; and he alludes to the incident again in a second poem, "Lucina Schynnyng in Silence of the Night."¹³ Damian was clever enough, however, to maintain his intimacy and influence with the credulous king, accompanying him about the country as his close companion in his sports and pastimes, always at the king's expense,¹⁴ and preparing to mulct him further with a fraudulent gold mining scheme shortly before James fell at Flodden Field.¹⁵

An account of James's protégé is given by John Leslie in his *Historie of Scotland*, 1578.¹⁶ Leslie tells the story of the aeronauti-

⁹ G. Gregory Smith, ed., *The Days of James IV* (London, 1900), p. 109, prints evidence of this weakness from James's letters and from the treasurer's accounts.

¹⁰ Sir James B. Paul, ed., *Accounts of the Lord High Treasurer of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1900-02), "Preface," II, lxxvi-lxxviii; III, xxxiv, lxxxvi-lxxxvii; IV, xvii.

¹¹ George Buchanan, *History of Scotland* (1582), trans. by James Aikman (Glasgow, 1856), II, 181-82.

¹² Paul, ed., *op. cit.*, II, 423.

¹³ John Small, ed., *Poems of William Dunbar*, II, Scottish Text Society, II and IV (1893), 139-43; I, Scottish Text Society, XVI (1893), 149-51.

¹⁴ Paul, ed., *op. cit.*, III, 179, 406; IV, 83, 89, 101, 103, 104, 110, 111.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, IV, 409; John Small, "Sketches of Early Scottish Alchemists," *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland*, XI (1874-75), 184-85.

¹⁶ E. G. Cody and William Murison, eds., *Historie of Scotland*, by Jhone Leslie, II, Scottish Text Society, XIX and XXXIV (1895), xvii-xxi. Bishop Leslie, who was Mary Stuart's faithful emissary to the court of Elizabeth,

cal experiment as "a singular disceit of a certane Abbot." This charlatan, he says, had previously beguiled King James with his pretended skill in alchemy and his pretended insight into mysterious matters. He would go to any length, it seemed, to capture the king's favor; but he was a fraud, hated by all men. Indeed, he was "sa disceitful, and had sa craftie and curious ingin to begyl, that he persuadet the king of his gret cunning in al thing natural . . . bot his intentioun only was to milk purses, quha knew nathing quhat he promiset."¹⁷

The account was repeated in substantially the same form, with Leslie credited as the source, in the 1587 edition of Holinshed's *Chronicles*. The strange impostor who victimized James IV, the author declares, was "a noble framer of deceit, and boaster of his wit [who] did on a time persuade the king, that he was so conuersant in all hidden knowledge of naturall things, and in the secret science of Alchumie." On the failure of his projects, his Scottish backers discovered that "their purses were emptied, and the vaine man was defamed by the breach of his promise . . . fallen into the hatred and offense of all men."¹⁸

An examination of the character of Ateukin indicates that Greene may have been acquainted with this historical tradition of an unscrupulous foreign sharper who boasted of his wonder-working powers, wormed himself into James IV's favor, inspired the hatred of the Scots, deceived the king into giving him money and honors, and failed to carry out any of his schemes because he "knew nathing quhat he promiset."

Ateukin in Greene's play is a penniless foreign adventurer in Edinburgh (I, ii, 523 ff.)¹⁹ who is determined "by wiles and words to rise" (I, i, 272). He introduces himself to the king as

a man of Art,
Who knowes, by constellation of the stars,
By oppositions and by drie aspects,
The things are past and those that are to come.

(I, i, 301-304)

wrote his history in Scottish dialect during his sequestration in London for his share in the Norfolk conspiracy. He presented the book to Mary in 1571. He then translated it into Latin for its publication in Rome in 1578. It was translated into French in 1579.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, II, 124-25.

¹⁸ Raphael Holinshed, *Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland* (1587), II, 292.

¹⁹ All references are to the text printed by Collins, *ed. cit.*, II, 89-158.

He divines the king's love for Ida by reading his horoscope in accordance with "the sooth of science" (I, i, 309 ff.). James is amazed at this exhibition of his skill (I, i, 325, 331 ff.). Seeing that the king is bemused, Ateukin subtly denies that he is a flattering courtier who would beg "This lease, this manor, or this pattent seal'd" in return for his service (I, i, 340), but he tells him, "your grace knowes schollers are but poore" (I, i, 343), and therefore

You cannot chuse but cast some gift apart,
To ease my bashful need that cannot beg.

(I, i, 346-347)

James quickly reassures him on this point:

Thine Art appeares in entrance of my loue;
And since I deeme thy wisedom matcht with truth,
I will exalt thee, and thy selfe alone
Shalt be the Agent to dissolve my grieve.

(I, i, 353-356)

In order to win Ida for the love-smitten king, Ateukin proposes to demonstrate again the power of his art:

Ile gather moly, crocus, and the earbes
That heales the wounds of body and the minde;
Ile set out charmes and spels, nought shal be left
To tame the wanton if she shall rebell.

(I, i, 379-382)

James thereupon promises him wealth and honors (I, i, 384 ff.).

These promises of the king are soon kept, for in Act I, scene ii Ateukin has already risen high at court. He has "wealth, honour, ease," and he congratulates himself on his "high promotion" (I, ii, 434 ff.). He realizes the insecurity of his position, however, and resolves to stop at nothing to remain in the king's favor:

For men of art, that rise by indirection
To honour and the fauour of their King,
Must vse all meanes to saue what they haue got.

(I, ii, 445-447)

In Act II, Ateukin is the acknowledged intimate of the king (II, i, 750 ff.), although it is generally known that he lives by his wits and his frauds practiced on the court (II, i, 776 ff.); and the lords of the realm soon begin to complain of the king's "intentive trust to flatterers" (II, ii, 915 ff.) and of Ateukin's "cloking

craft" (II, ii, 1005). In this same act his advertised "charmes and spels" fail utterly to influence the chaste Ida, before whom he unsuccessfully lays the king's suit (II, i, 785-839). James loses patience at this collapse of Ateukin's boastful scheme, asking, "Are these thy fruites of wit, thy sight of Art . . . ?" (II, ii, 1043). Yet he gives heed to the plan to have the Queen done away with, and promises him that if Ida yields

Thou shalt haue what thou wilt; Ile giue thee straight
A Barrony, an Earledome for reward.

(II, ii, 1096-1097)

Thereafter Ateukin becomes notorious for his crafty frauds (III, i, 1144 ff.; III, iii, 1347 ff.), which he practices with impunity protected by his position in the kingdom close to James. He is now "my Lord Ateukin" (III, ii, 1191 ff.), and according to Andrew, his servant, he "lius by cousoning the King" (IV, iii, 1554).

As the political action of the plot becomes more complicated following the disappearance and supposed death of the Queen, Ateukin laments the approaching miscarriage of his plans:

What, was I borne to be the scorne of kinne?
To gather feathers like to a hopper crowe,
And loose them in the height of all my pompe?

(V, ii, 1939-1941)

In the end, of course, Ateukin and his "lewde compeeres" (V, vi, 2409) are ordered apprehended and hanged under martial law (V, vi, 2424 ff.).

Greene has created in Ateukin, a character not found in his source, an excellent type of the parasite and evil flatterer, as well as a type of the Machiavellian villain. He has also created a crafty impostor who crawls into King James's favor by pretending to possess occult powers, alienates the Scots, works on the king's credulity to gain both profit and promotion, and remains in high favor for a time despite his palpable frauds. This characterization, in the light of the evidence presented, may possibly have been patterned after an original who was well known in historical tradition as much the same sort of unscrupulous individual.

WALDO F. MCNEIR

University of Chicago

**MORE ABOUT CALDERÓN, BOURSAULT, AND
RAVENSROFT**

Professor Lancaster's hypothesis¹ of the relationship between Boursault's *Ne pas croire ce qu'on void, histoire espagnolle*, Thomas Corneille's *Les Engagements du hazard*, Calderón's *Casa con dos puertas* and *Los Empeños de un acaso*, and Ravenscroft's *The Wrangling Lovers*, leaves much to be desired. We are asked to believe that Boursault's

statement that his translation is not faithful may be due to the fact that he added the minor plot of Elvire-Francisque, a little historical background, certain humorous comments, and a few episodes, especially those of the rendezvous that the veiled lady does not keep, of the valet's search for the veiled lady, the bath incident, and Elvire's excursion with her brother into the country.²

Since the Elvire-Francisque plot alone constitutes about one-tenth of Boursault's novel, we would have indeed a prime case of infidelity in translation!

Moved by dissatisfaction with Mr. Lancaster's explanation, I have made a careful study of all the works involved and of another play of Calderón's, *Fuego de dios en el querer bien*, which, in part, resembles *Casa con dos puertas*. The results are most interesting.

At three points, *The Wrangling Lovers* shows phraseology found also in Calderón but not in Boursault:

(1) When Ruis comments to Gusman on his early rising, the latter says, "I had some thoughts in my mind that broke my repose."⁴ Boursault has merely, "Dom Ruis . . . dormoit avec une grande economie [sic] quand son amoureux ami entra dans sa chambre, tira son rideau, & lui apprit toutes les circonstances de son aventure. . . ."⁵ But, in *Casa con dos puertas*, Calderón has almost the words Ravenscroft used, though he gives the speech to Félix, who would correspond to Ruis,

¹ *MLN*, December, 1936, **LI**, 523-8.

² P. 526.

³ P. 525.

⁴ *The Wrangling Lovers*, London, 1677, I, p. 6.

⁵ *Les Apparences trompeuses ou Ne pas croire ce qu'on void. Histoire espagnolle*. Amsterdam, 1718, p. 36.

Un cuidado, que me trae
 Desvelado, no permite
 Que sosiegue ni descanse.⁶

(2) At the scene of his snatching the note from Sanco, Diego says to the servant, "Stay, Friend, till I have read it,"⁷ which is not in the French. In *Los Empeños*, Félix (Diego) commands Hernando (Sanco), "Esperad; no os vais . . . Hasta que yo haya leido."⁸

(3) When Octavia tries to keep Diego from entering the closet where Gusman is hidden, she cries, "Hold you must not Sir, my Father will come in there immediately, that being the coolest Room in the house, he alwayes writes his Letters there, and order'd when he went out, that Pen, ink, and paper should be carried in ready against his return."⁹ The temperature only is in Boursault,

. . . Blanche, qui avoit ses raisons pour l'empêcher d'y entrer, l'arrêta par le bras, & lui dit que c'étoit là qu'ordinairement son pere se retroit quand il revenoit de la Ville, parce qu'il y faisoit plus frais qu'ailleurs . . .¹⁰

But the writing is in *Casa con dos puertas*, where Laura (Octavia) detains Félix (Diego):

LAURA.

Aguarda, espera;
 Que no has de entrar aquí dentro.

DON FELIX.

¿Por qué?

LAURA

Porque siempre aquí
 Está mi padre escribiendo
 Mucha parte de la noche.¹¹

These verbal similarities certainly could not be coincidental; nor is it conceivable that Ravenscroft would have known Calderón's plays and used *only* these phrases. The inevitable conclusion is that both Ravenscroft and Calderón were using a Spanish novel, which Boursault translated.¹²

This conclusion is strengthened by another verbal similarity in

⁶ I, iii.

⁷ I, xii.

¹⁰ P. 296.

⁷ IV, p. 45.

⁸ v, pp. 66-7.

¹¹ II, vii.

¹² The possibility of Calderón's having used the Spanish novel seems not to have occurred to Mr. Lancaster, who writes, "It is most improbable that there is a Spanish novel that was Boursault's source, not only because it has never been discovered, but because it would have to include just the parts of *Los Empeños* and of *Casa con dos puertas* that Thomas Corneille utilized." (P. 526)

corresponding passages of *The Wrangling Lovers*, *Ne pas croire ce qu'on void*, and Calderón's *Fuego de dios en el querer bien*, which also would seem to be based in part on the elusive Spanish novel. On coming out of the closet where he had taken Gusman's place, Diego upbraids Octavia, ending, "O ungrateful and perfidious."¹³ In the French, this runs, "De peur que ce quart d'heure là ne fût perdu il l'employa à l'appeler ingrate, lâche, perfide. . . ."¹⁴ In *Fuego de dios en el querer bien*, Juan calls Beatriz, in precisely the same situation, "Fiera, ingrata, desleal, Aleve, falsa, cruel. . . ."¹⁵

From this evidence I believe we may safely conclude:

- (1) that Boursault was translating an "histoire espagnolle" and that, as he himself stated, his translation was not entirely faithful, so that, at three points, phraseology used by Ravenscroft from the original does not show in the French.
- (2) that Ravenscroft based his *Wrangling Lovers* not on Boursault's translation but on the original Spanish, and
- (3) that Calderón used the same Spanish "histoire" for his *Casa con dos puertas* and *Los Empeños de un acaso* and for part of *Fuego de dios en el querer bien*.

JAMES URVIN RUNDLE

Indiana University

¹³ v, p. 68.

¹⁴ P. 304.

¹⁵ Should we adjust this evidence to Mr. Lancaster's theory, we would have Boursault forming his novel from T. Corneille's *Les Engagements*, Calderón's *Casa con dos puertas*, his own invention, and a pair of words from *Fuego de dios en el querer bien!* And still all that would leave Ravenscroft's verbal similarities to passages in Calderón's two plays quite unexplained! The fact that Ravenscroft was adapting the Spanish and not the French would nullify Mr. Lancaster's evidence (p. 525, footnote) for Boursault's having used *Les Engagements*. Ravenscroft's maid, like Corneille's, is called Beatrice (Beatrix); Ravenscroft and Boursault are identical in the affair of the valet, in which Corneille is much nearer to Calderón, despite the stabbing; and the unwanted suitor is in *The Wrangling Lovers*, where, as in Boursault, he is called Francisco de Medina. This unwelcome lover is used only slightly in both the English and French plays, but he figures in the chief sub-plot of the novel. It is most unlikely that, if Boursault had used Corneille, there would not be provable verbal reflections; but these do not exist. It seems highly possible that Corneille knew the Spanish novel as well as Calderón's plays. Naturally, as a dramatist, he would then adapt the plays, which would "lie" better for his purpose. His memory of the name Beatrix and of the unwelcome lover idea—which he gives quite independent treatment—would hardly necessitate his mentioning the novel as another source.

STILL MORE ABOUT CALDERÓN, BOURSAULT,
AND RAVENSCROFT

Mr. Rundle's discoveries have led to this extraordinary conclusion: there once was a Spanish novel that was imitated by Calderón in three plays, then probably by a French dramatist, certainly by a French novelist, then by an English dramatist, yet no Spanish scholar knows what its title was or where the text is to be found, not even Martinenche, though he tried to discover it, or Mr. Rundle! Nor is this all. As Ravencroft's play is obviously much closer to Boursault's novel than it is to the three plays of Calderón, and as, according to Mr. Rundle, Ravenscroft did not use Boursault, but went straight to the Spanish novel, we must have the text of this unknown work best preserved in the English version, next best in the French novel, and finally in the Spanish play! The hypothesis recalls Gibbon's remark about miracles, that detailed knowledge of them increases as opportunity for observing them diminishes.

Now on what evidence are these miraculous conclusions based? In the first place, on the fact that Boursault called his novel a "Traduction Espagnole." As he does not say that his source was a novel, as he refers to his translation as none too faithful, as he admits disguising the title, transposing certain incidents, and skipping what he did not understand, I suggested that he was following the example of Thomas Corneille, who had imitated in his *Engagemens du hazard* Calderón's *Empeños de un Acaso* except in his fourth act, when he followed the same author's *Casa con dos puertas*. This would explain the origin of about five-sixths of the French novel, but Rundle considers my explanation unsatisfactory. He writes as if he were discussing a work by a contemporary translator, but in the seventeenth century even professional translators added phrases of their own, and Boursault's humorous references to his Spanish original show that he is not to be taken very seriously as a translator. In fact there are passages in which it is clear that he is not translating,¹ and he may well have allowed himself digressions that take up a sixth of his novel.²

¹ He refers, for instance (pp. 181-2), to an event as happening 216 years before the time in which he is writing, 1670, the date of his novel, not that of his source. His joke about the gender of the word "Comette" (p. 167) would have no point in Spanish.

² His chief digression concerns Don Francisque, Elvire's unwelcome fiancé.

In the second place, Mr. Rundle submits as evidence four cases in which he thinks that details given in the Spanish novel have been preserved in three of Calderón's plays and by Ravenscroft, but not by Boursault. Let us look at these cases: (1) In *Casa con dos puertas* X says to Y that anxiety kept him awake; in the *Wrangling Lovers* Y says to X that his thoughts woke him up. The resemblance is so slight that it is without significance. (2) A valet is told to wait until a letter has been read, both in *los Empeños de un Acaso* and in the *Wrangling Lovers*. This rare thought, according to Mr. Rundle, could not have occurred to Ravenscroft independently. (3) In *Casa con dos puertas* a man is told not to enter a room because a father writes there much of the night, while in the English play it is said that the father "always writes his letters there." So strange an occupation for the father of a family could not have been invented by Ravenscroft, according to Mr. Rundle. (4) In a third play by Calderón, *Fuego de Dios en el querer bien*, a lover calls his beloved, "Fiera, ingrata, desleal, Aleve, falsa, cruel"; in the French novel he is more restrained, saluting her as "ingrate, lâche, perfide"; in the English play he exercises such control over his emotions that he dubs her merely "ungrateful and perfidious." Even Mr. Rundle cannot deny that Ravenscroft is here nearer to the French than he is to the Spanish, but he holds (cf. his note 15) that, if my theory is correct, Boursault cannot have invented his three adjectives; he must have derived them from the Spanish novel!

Now Mr. Rundle's hypothesis is based on his refusal to admit coincidence, even in very minor matters, yet if I had space enough I could submit examples of coincidence, not borrowing, much more striking than these Mr. Rundle cites. His entire hypothesis, moreover, depends upon the assumption that Ravenscroft did not imitate Boursault. I will now show that this assumption is erroneous.

A valet in the French novel is named Ordogno (Spanish Ordoño), a name that becomes in Ravenscroft Organo. Whence the *g*? Certainly from the French, not from the Spanish. Ravenscroft's Count de Benevent has the French form of his name, not

Its introduction may have been suggested by Thomas Corneille, in whose play *Elvire* is also engaged and the engagement is broken. Boursault substituted a more entertaining way to rid *Elvire* of this fiancé.

Benavente, the Spanish. "Sixty and fourteen duccates" (p. 28) is a translation of Boursault's "soixante & quatorze ducats" (p. 98); to express 74 in this manner is neither Spanish nor English. Ravenscroft writes (p. 20), "an adieu *Jusqu' au revoir*," following Boursault (p. 69), "un adieu jusqu' au revoir"; one can hardly suppose that the Spanish novelist dropped into French at this point. Both Ravenscroft (p. 46) and Boursault (p. 47) bring into a comic passage a threat to report a person to the Inquisition; would a Spanish author have dared do this?³ These examples make it clear that Ravenscroft imitated Boursault. They show that Mr. Rundle's similarities between the English dramatist and Calderón are due merely to coincidence.

If he could give up his obsession of the Spanish novel, he would realize how great a debt Ravenscroft owed to Boursault, from whom he derived his plot, most of the names he gave his characters, the location in Toledo, and many passages that are obvious translations. Compare, for instance, the letters found in a scene from which Mr. Rundle has quoted a line:

Yo no pude excusar el lance de anoche, porque estando esperando para hablarte, como me habías ofrecido, entró aquel caballero, y sacando la espada, fué forzoso que yo me defendiera. Avísame en qué ha parado; que, hasta asegurarme de tu peligro, no quiero hablar en mis sentimientos. Dios te guarde. (*Empeños, I*)

J'ay suivi ponctuellement le Conseil que vous m'avez donné, & quelque avantage que Dom Diegue pretend avoir eu la nuit passée, je luy ay cédé la place, plus en Amant respectueux qu'en Rival timide. Hastez-vous de me faire profiter de son malheur, comme vous me l'avez promis, & ne refusez pas de m'apprendre ce qui s'est passé après ma retraite. (B., pp. 189-90)

I have followed your counsel and what ever advantage *Don Diego* pretends to have had in the Rancountre. Yet be assur'd, tho overpow'r'd by his numbers, I retreated more like a respectful Lover, than a cowardly Rival; make haste to let me profit by his misfortunes, and fail not to acquaint me with what happen'd after I withdrew. (R., pp. 45-6)

The verbal similarity between the French and English, in contrast with them and most of the Spanish, is here so striking that

³ I might also mention the use of a *camouflet*, a typically French device, employed in a play of 1670, Poisson's *Femmes coquettes*. It is referred to by Boursault, p. 22, and by Ravenscroft (p. 2) in the phrase, "when I had no more paper left to burn under my Nose." I have never seen this in a Spanish play or novel. Perhaps Mr. Rundle can find an example.

there can be no doubt. Coincidence cannot explain it, as it does the phrases cited by Mr. Rundle.

He also argues that Thomas Corneille may have imitated the Spanish novel and may not have been imitated by Boursault, but Corneille's case is different from Ravenscroft's, for he frankly indicated his sources, as the English dramatist failed to do. Now his statement that he first imitated *los Empeños* and then modified the fourth act by imitating *Casa con dos puertas* cannot be dismissed, nor is there any evidence whatsoever to support Mr. Rundle's suggestion that he had also seen the elusive novel. The only question is whether Thomas Corneille inspired Boursault. It is true that there are many passages in which both of these French authors may be translating Calderón, but there are some in which Boursault's text resembles Corneille's more closely than it does the Spanish:

en petite-monnoye il m'a bien sceu payer. (*Engagemens*, II, 5)
 il m'a payé le port en si belle moyoye.⁴ (B., p. 206)
 Bourrez-le donc tous deux. (*Engagemens*, II, 5)
 leur conseilla . . . de le bourer tous deux. (B., p. 209)⁵
 Que vos gens . . . Fassent courir le bruit que vous estes absent. (*Eng.*, III, 3)
 que vos gens fassent courir le bruit que vous estes party. (B., pp. 213-4)
 Si j'ay des ennemis ils seront genereux. (*Eng.*, III, 3)
 mes ennemis . . . seront sans doute genereux. (B., p. 215)
 Ce logis n'a-t'il pas vne porte secrete? (*Eng.*, IV, 1)
 la porte secrete de ce logis. (B., p. 240)⁶
 me priuer d'vn bien dont ie m'auoë indigne. (*Eng.*, V, 2)
 vous me priveriez d'un honneur dont je demeure d'accord que je suis
 indigne. (B., p. 279)
 Que ie regeoie au moins mon eögé par sa bouche. (*Eng.*, V, 3)
 je ne la quitteray point que je ne reçoive mon congé de sa propre
 bouche. (B., p. 283)

Finally, in the French play, as in Boursault, but not in Calderón, one of the heroines is engaged against her will and does not marry her first fiancé, while the other has a maid named Beatrice.⁷

⁴ In both cases *monnoye* means the blows the valet has received.

⁵ In the corresponding situation *los Empeños* reads:

¿Hay mas de buscarle entrambos,
 Y darle entrambos á una?

⁶ In *Casa con dos puertas* reference is made to two doors, but not to a secret door.

⁷ She is Ines in one Spanish play; Celia in the other; Beatrice in Ravenscroft.

It seems clear that Boursault made use of Thomas Corneille, to whom he probably refers in his preface.⁸ Directed by him to Calderón, he took most of his plot from *los Empeños* and *Casa con dos puertas*, but in some instances modified his wording to agree with that of the French dramatist. As he could trace most of his intrigue and characters back to these Spanish plays, he felt justified in saying that his novel was "une Traduction Espagnole." It was well enough known in England to be translated as *Deception Visus*⁹ and to be dramatized by Ravenscroft, who had already imitated *le Bourgeois Gentilhomme* and *Pourceaugnac*.

This explanation seems satisfactory to me. I regret that it does not seem so to Mr. Rundle. He reminds me of the nineteenth-century scholars who used to posit German sources for Old French poems, but who were never able to lay their hands on the originals. If Mr. Rundle wishes to add to our knowledge, he should search for the unknown Spanish novel in whose existence he so firmly believes, but, before he starts on his quest, it will be well for him to reflect upon the adventures of Boursault's Mandoce, who wandered through the streets of Toledo asking all those he met if they could point out to him the dwelling of a veiled lady whose face he had never seen, whose province he was unable to indicate, and whose name he did not know. When he undertakes a similar mission, may he not, like Mandoce, receive "un coup de poing qui le fit reculer plus de quatre pas"!

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

The Johns Hopkins University

THE BIRTH DATE OF LORD HERBERT OF CHERBURY

One would think that a man who went to the trouble to write his autobiography would somewhere or other in it mention the date of his birth, but Lord Herbert of Cherbury was not so accommodating. He did, to be sure, tell where he was born and even the hour of the day—at Eyton in Shropshire, between twelve and one o'clock in the morning¹—but about the year, month, and day

⁸ Cf. *MLN.*, LI, 524, where the passage is quoted.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 526.

¹ *The Autobiography of Edward, Lord Herbert of Cherbury*, ed. Sidney Lee (rev. ed.; London, 1906), p. 15.

itself he was completely mum. The last two dates, however, are known from his poem "In diem Natalitum, viz. 3. Mar."² and also from a letter to him written by his cousin, Francis Newport, referring to March 3 as his birthday.³ The year has been more difficult to ascertain.

In the *Autobiography* Herbert made several statements about his approximate age at the time of various events which may be precisely dated from either his own or external evidence, but they are unfortunately inconsistent, not because Herbert was trying to confuse scholars but because he was an old man when he wrote and the events referred to all had happened a long time ago. For what they are worth, these statements may be synopsized as follows (the date in parentheses is the date of the event referred to):

- a. He was eight years old when his grandfather, Edward Herbert, died⁴ (May, 1593).⁵
- b. He was about four years older when his father, Richard, died⁶ (October, 1596).⁷
- c. He was twelve when he entered Oxford⁸ (May, 1596).⁹
- d. He was not many months older when his father died¹⁰ (see above).
- e. He was about fifteen when he was married (February 28, 1599).¹¹
- f. He was about eighteen, or between eighteen and nineteen, when he left Oxford and went with his mother to London¹² (Herbert says this was about the year 1600, just before the Earl of Essex's rising—February, 1601).¹³

The resulting birth dates are (a) 1585; (b) 1584 or, since the interval between the two deaths was not quite three and one-half years, 1585; (c) 1584; (d) 1584; (e) 1584; (f) 1582. These dates are based on the supposition that Herbert was using cardinal numbers, but if it was the ordinal that was intended, the date involved would have to be one year later.

² *The Poems of Lord Herbert of Cherbury*, ed. G. C. Moore Smith (Oxford, 1923), p. 88.

³ H. M. C., *Tenth Report, Part IV*, p. 379.

⁴ *Autobiography*, p. 2.

⁵ *Montgomeryshire Collections*, xi (1878), 370.

⁶ *Autobiography*, p. 2.

⁷ *Montgomeryshire Collections*, xi, 370.

⁸ *Autobiography*, p. 21.

⁹ *Reg. Oxon.*, II, ii, 214.

¹⁰ *Autobiography*, p. 21.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 22. Herbert himself supplies this date.

¹² *Ibid.*, pp. 22, 43.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 43.

The Oxford register, in the entry already cited, gives Herbert's age as fourteen at the time of matriculation. This contradicts his own statement and would make his birth fall in either 1582 or 1583, depending upon whether the age was reckoned from the last or the next birthday. This information has the advantage of being objective, although, as Andrew Clark, the editor of the register, has pointed out, the entries are all too often inaccurate.¹⁴

One other piece of evidence has been brought forward. It occurs in a letter written by Herbert to his brother Henry, dated June 14, 1643, and containing this sentence: "And let me assure you I find myself grown older in this one year than in fifty-nine years before."¹⁵ The answer to this mathematical problem is 1583.

Sir Sidney Lee, after remarking that Herbert's statements were "too self-contradictory to prove anything," decided in favor of 1583, but without giving any reason for his choice.¹⁶ Amusingly enough, he then "corrected" Herbert's statement of his age as fifteen at the time of his marriage, with a figure—seventeen—impossible unless Herbert was born in 1582.¹⁷ Later scholars have followed Lee.¹⁸

It is curious that neither Lee nor anyone else seems ever to have wondered how, if Magdalen Herbert gave birth to Edward on March 3, 1583, she could have had another child, Elizabeth, ready to be baptized on November 10 of the same year,¹⁹ unless the second

¹⁴ *Reg. Oxon.*, II, i, xxiv-xxvi.

¹⁵ Quoted in *Autobiography*, p. 149.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 15, n. 3.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 22, n. 5.

¹⁸ Cf. Harold R. Hutcheson, *Lord Herbert of Cherbury's De Religione Laici* (New Haven, 1944), p. 8, n. 6, in which particular stress is placed upon the letter cited above, and the statement is made that "there is practically no evidence compatible with his being born after 1583 or before 1581." The implication is that Herbert's own statements suggesting 1584 and 1585 are of no value. I do not understand how 1581 may be arrived at from any of the data at Hutcheson's disposal, although I am aware that this date was adopted by some of Lee's predecessors—by the Earl of Powis, for instance, in his introductory notice to Herbert's *The Expedition to the Isle of Rhé* (London, 1860) and apparently by John Churton Collins in the introduction to his edition of Herbert's *Poems* (London, 1881), though the references are indirectly made (see pp. xv and xxiv). The *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Ninth Edition, gives 1582.

¹⁹ Montgomery parish register; see *Montgomeryshire Collections*, XI, 370. Lee gives the information in the *Autobiography*, p. 14, n. 3.

baby was a decidedly premature one. Prematurity, of course, is not rare, but in the Sixteenth Century babies born very much before their time could not have had a very good chance to survive, especially if they were born in a draughty castle in November. Yet little Elizabeth did not die; she grew up, married, and had three children.²⁰ The objection that she constitutes to Herbert's being born in March, 1583, is not insurmountable, to be sure, but it is definitely not to be disregarded.

Fortunately, it is possible to clear up the whole matter. Why the clarifying was not done years ago it is hard to understand, for the evidence has been available not only in the Public Record Office, but also, and much more conveniently, since 1900 in the *Montgomeryshire Collections*, in which it is reprinted.²¹ Since Lee's two editions of the *Autobiography* antedate this volume, he may be forgiven, but no one, as far as I know, not even any writer in the *Collections* themselves, has realized that the document contained therein takes the date of Herbert's birth out of the realm of speculation and makes it a matter of fact.

The document referred to is one of the *Inquisitions Post Mortem*. It was taken at Montgomery on December 30, 39 Elizabeth (1596), shortly after the death of Herbert's father. After listing the properties of which he was seized at the time of his death, it concludes with the statement that Edward Herbert, the heir, "was eleven years, seven months, and eleven days old on the day his father died." It is known from the parish register that Richard was buried on October 15 (see above) and this tallies neatly with Edward's birthday plus seven months and eleven days—the result is October 14. As for the year of his birth, it must be 1585.

There is no reason to doubt the accuracy of the inquisition. The jury which took it was under oath to present the true facts, and would be particularly careful to get the correct age of the heir because he was a minor, a fact of great importance since he would automatically become Elizabeth's ward. Later the guardianship would be transferred to someone else on receipt of proper payment, and the sum involved would depend on the value of the inheritance and on the length of time the guardian could count on having

²⁰ *Autobiography*, p. 14.

²¹ XXXI, pp. 332-3 (of the supplement).

control of and the income from his ward's property. Hence the importance of accuracy in the inquisitions.

If Herbert was born in 1585 he was Magdalen's second child, Elizabeth being older by about a year and a half. It has always been assumed that he was the eldest, though there is really nothing to warrant the assumption. Another consequence of moving his birth date up two years is to give greater point to his anecdote about his meeting with Queen Elizabeth:

... I was . . . upon my knees in the presence-chamber, when she passed by to the Chapel at Whitehall. As soon as she saw me, she stopped, and swearing, her usual oath, demanded, 'Who is this?' Everybody there present looked upon me, but no man knew me, until Sir James Croft, a pensioner, finding the Queen stayed, returned back and told who I was, and that I had married Sir William Herbert of St. Julian's daughter. The Queen hereupon looked attentively upon me, and swearing her ordinary oath, said it is pity he was married so young, and thereupon gave her hand to kiss twice, both times gently clapping me on the cheek.²²

This took place, probably, in 1601, when Herbert was only sixteen and had yet been married for two years. Perhaps one of the reasons why the scene stuck in his memory was that he too thought it a pity that he was married so young—and to a wife seven years his senior.²³

Finally, it should be noticed that Herbert's own statements about his age hold up pretty well—better than they do for 1583. As shown above, all but one of the dates arrived at from the *Autobiography* are on the near side of 1583, and the substitution of ordinals for cardinals would make the 1584's come out 1585's. The last date of the series, 1582, is still wide of the mark, as is the statement in the letter of 1643. In the latter case, the discrepancy may be due to the attractiveness of the round number, sixty. As for the Oxford register, it will just have to be wrong.

DON A. KEISTER

University of Akron

²² *Autobiography*, p. 44.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 22.

BENEVOLENCE, SENSIBILITY AND SENTIMENT IN SOME EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY PERIODICALS

The three closely related terms—benevolence, sensibility, and sentiment (or sentimental)—echoed throughout the eighteenth century, and modern scholarship has studied them often. Yet references to these three terms which I have come across in eighteenth-century periodicals may be of value.

BENEVOLENCE

- Guardian* (1713). No. 126.
- Spectator* (1714). Nos. 588, 601.
- New Memoirs of Literature*, II (1725), 43—"Beneficence and Liberality."
- London Magazine*, I (1732), 236—"Benevolence and Public Spirit."
- " I (1732), 135—"Lord Shaftesbury Vindicated."
- " II (1733), 192—"Benevolence and Friendship."
- " XIV (1745), 218—"Selfish and Mercenary Spirit Now Prevailing."
- * *Muscum; or the Literary and Historical Register*, I (1746), 414—"Benevolence."
- London Magazine*, XVI (1747), 282—"Generosity and Benevolence."
- Universal Magazine*, VI (1750), 84—"Essay on Good Nature."
- " IX (1751), 257—"Danger of Breaking the Laws of Benevolence."
- " XIV (1753), 157—"Benevolence of the Deity."
- " XVIII (1756), 174—"Hymn to Benevolence."
- Critical Review*, IX (1760), 4.
- British Magazine*, III (1762), 24—"An Essay on Benevolence."
- Visitor* (1764). No. 54. "Benevolence."
- Scots Magazine*, XXVIII (1766), 113—"Female Humility and Benevolence."
- London Magazine*, XXXIX (1770), 28, 88, 137, 202 . . . 660—Essays on Benevolent Society Proceedings.
- Critical Review*, XL (1775), 263—"The Benevolent Man."
- London Magazine*, XLIV (1775), 594—review of a book, *The Benevolent Man*.
- Universal Magazine*, LXI (1777), 39—"The Progress of Benevolence"—a Poem.
- " LXII (1778), 95—"Verses on Benevolence."
- London Magazine*, XLIX (1780), 30—"On Benevolence."
- Universal Magazine*, LXVII (1780), 150—"The Pleasures of Benevolence."
- " LXVIII (1781), 345—"Benevolence recommended."
- " LXIX (1781), 228—"Selfishness and Benevolence Compared."

BENEVOLENCE, SENSIBILITY AND SENTIMENT 395

Universal Magazine, LXXI (1782), 304 — "Instances of Delicate Benevolence."

" LXXIX (1786), 272 — "Instances of Benevolence."

European Magazine, X (1786), 307, 466 — "Extraordinary Benevolence."

Universal Magazine, LXXX (1787), 254 — Benevolence (scale of virtues and vices).

Critical Review, LXIII (1787), 156 — "The Triumph of Benevolence" — a poem.

Analytical Review, I (1788), 343 — "On Benevolence." (A poem)

Hibernian Magazine — 1788 — p. 719 — "Benevolence."

Monthly Review, LXXXI (1789), 460 — "Man of Benevolence."

Analytical Review, XII (1792), 414 — review of sermons by P. Houghton.

Monthly Review, X (1793), 534 — Translation of an Essay on Benevolence (from German).

Critical Review, LXXXIII (1795), 296 — review of *A Dissertation on the Theory and Practice of Benevolence* — by George Dyer.

British Critic, VIII (1796), 230 — from Fawcett's *Sermons*.

Monthly Review, XXII (1797), 6 — "On Benevolence," in *Essays by a Society at Exeter*.

Gentleman's Magazine, Index to I-LVI (1786), gives only four items which have Benevolence in the title. Shaftesbury has 13 such references. From 1787-1800: 3 such items.

Similarly the Index to *The Monthly Review* through vol. LX (1784) gives 11 such items on Benevolence and 8 on Shaftesbury, where such topics appear in the title.

SENSIBILITY

This term does not appear in the title of any article or poem published in the *London Magazine*, the *Universal Magazine*, or the *Gentleman's Magazine* before 1750. The Index to the *Monthly Review* through 1784 gives only four such items.

Guardian (1713), No. 19.

Dublin Magazine, I (1762), 310 — "Sensibility" — a poem. (Notice the tremendous jump in time.)

Scots Magazine, XXXIV (1772), 619 — "Ode to Sensibility."

London Magazine, XLII (1773), 197 — "Ode to Sensibility."

Lady's Magazine, IV (1773), 251 — "Inconveniences of Sensibility."

" IX (1778), 396 — "On Sensibility."

Mirror (1779-80), Nos. 42, 43, 44 — "Story of La Roche."

Universal Magazine, LXVII (1780), 193, 229 — reprints from Donaldson's *Elements of Beauty*.

Hibernian Magazine, 1781, p. 440 — "Description of Sensibility."

Universal Magazine, LXX (1782), 98 — "Traits of Sensibility" — a poem.
" LXXI (1782), 29 — Sensibility.

Scots Magazine, XLV (1783), 660 — "Sensibility — an Irregular Ode."

Lady's Magazine, XV (1784), 20 — "Reflections on the Harmony of Sensibility and Reason."

Scots Magazine, XLVII (1785), 113 — "On the Sensibility of insects."

Lounger (1785-6). Nos. 77, 90.

Universal Magazine, LXXX (1787), 255 — Sensibility.

" LXXXI (1787), 347 — "Of Affected Sensibility."

Scots Magazine, XLIX (1787), 34, 61 — "An Essay on Sensibility" — by a Lady.

Critical Review, LXIII (1787), 389 — *Excessive Sensibility* — review of a book.

Knox, V. *Winter Evenings* (1787), II, 256 — "On Affected Sensibility."

Hibernian Magazine, 1788, p. 90 — "Of Affected Sensibility."

Analytical Review, II (1788), 88 — review of Knox's *Winter Evenings*.

" v (1789), 356 — "On Sensibility."

Critical Review, LXVIII (1789), 444 — "An Essay on Sensibility" — a poem.

Monthly Review, LXXXI (1789), 417 — review of a poem: "An Essay on Sensibility."

Scots Magazine, LII (1790), 553 — "Hymn to Sensibility."

Universal Magazine, LXXXVI (1790), 60 — "On Unaffected Sensibility."

Analytical Review, VII (1790), 292.

" VIII (1790), 318.

Hibernian Magazine, Pt. II (1790), 132 — "On Unaffected Sensibility."

From Dr. Blair's third vol. of sermons.

Universal Magazine, LXXXVIII (1791), 128, 336.

The Bee (Edinburgh, 1791-3), 217 — Poem to Sensibility.

Universal Magazine, XC (1792), 227, 325 — Sensibility necessary.

Looker-On (1792), No. 62. "Modern Sensibility."

Analytical Review, XX (1794), 226.

Monthly Magazine, II (1796), 706 — "Question: Ought Sensibility to be cherished or repressed?" (*Enquirer*, No. IX)

British Critic, XIII (1799), 54 — a few lines in a poem.

Hibernian Magazine, Pt. II (1799), 172 — "The Birth of Sensibility."

SENTIMENT

Gentleman's Magazine, Index to Vols. I-LVI gives 4 references to titles including sentimental or sentiment. From 1787-1800: 1 item.

Index to *Monthly Review* through 1784 gives only 5 such items.

Lady's Magazine, III (1772), 305 — "Thoughts on the Word Sentimental."

Universal Magazine, LXII (1778), 172 — "On Delicacy of Sentiment."

Mirror (1779-80). No. 101.

Universal Magazine, LXXVII (1785), 288 — "On the Difference between Romantic and Sentimental Characters."

European Magazine, IX (1786), 97 — "A Comparison between Laughing and Sentimental Comedy."

Observer (1785-90). Nos. 104 and 105. Memoirs of a Sentimentalist.

The Bee (Edinburgh, 1792), 201. "Essay on Delicacy of Sentiment."

Lady's Magazine, XXIII (1792), 301 — "On the Word Sentiment."

(No reference to sentiment in titles in the *London Magazine* or *Universal Magazine* before 1750.)

The most astonishing aspect of the above three eighteenth-century lists is the extreme popularity of Benevolence in the early part of the century, as Miss Whitney has pointed out,¹ and the similar popularity of Sensibility in the later eighteenth century. Both of these terms completely eclipse the third, Sentiment, from the point of view of the interest of eighteenth-century readers. One wonders whether the above proportions would hold true after a thorough investigation.

R. W. BABCOCK

Wayne University

CHARLES READE AND THE COLLINSES

Malcolm Elwin's account of Charles Reade's literary feud with the Collinses (Mortimer and his wife Frances) is in most essentials both correct and intelligent.¹ But unfortunately it is not quite complete, only suggesting in a general way how the controversy happened to end as it did—with Frances Collins actually dedicating one of Mortimer's posthumous works "To Charles Reade, Dramatist and Novelist. . . . 'The animosities perish: the humanities are eternal.'"

From denunciation (1873-1875) to dedication (1880)—an unusual pattern of development, and it is directly attributable to Reade's unusual personality and beliefs. What follows is the story behind the quarrel and reconciliation, as told by Frank Merivale in an article that Reade's biographers seem to have overlooked:

Just before Mortimer Collins's death, he happened in some way to run counter to the prejudices of one of the most brilliant and rugged of men of letters, with whom he was personally unacquainted. His sin brought upon his head—in the 'Athenaeum' or 'Notes and Queries,' I think—a very lava-flood of scathing denunciation from the offended Olympian. Before he had time to answer, Mortimer Collins was dead. Three years

¹ Lois Whitney, *Primitivism and the Idea of Progress* (Baltimore, 1934), pp. 21-6, 82-90, 332-33. For many suggestions—including this footnote—in developing this little article I am greatly indebted to Professor R. D. Havens of The Johns Hopkins University.

¹ See Malcolm Elwin, *Charles Reade* (London, 1931), pp. 74, 159-160, 244-247; and S. M. Ellis, *Wilkie Collins Le Fanu and Others* (New York, 1931), pp. 115-116. For the most complete account of the controversy, see Reade's *Trade Malice*, usually printed as an appendix to his novel *The Wandering Heir*.

later, when his widow was in trouble at Isleworth, and saw no one, her little maid refused to unlock the gate to a white-haired burly stranger. Standing outside, he shyly murmured something about "a friend of Edmund Yates." This acted like magic, as many were the packets and letters the girl had posted to that address: and he was shown in.

"Mrs. Mortimer Collins, I think?"

"Yes."

"God bless you. Take this."

He thrust a roll of bank-notes into her hand, and was off in his carriage again without another word, leaving her to look blankly after him. It was a little time before she learned that her visitor was Charles Reade, and that the timely kindness was his atonement for his haste. He kept the kindness up: and one of the first literary boarders who came to lighten Frances Collins' burdens at her Eastbourne house was Charles Reade. It was not long before his death; and it was there that I myself met him for the last time.²

Although Merivale seems to be offering first-hand knowledge, a good part of this account is obviously biased in favor of the Collinsses. It is hardly fair to present Mortimer as an injured innocent, when the truth is that both he and his wife had wantonly attacked Reade (in "two pseudonymous letters"),³ charging him with the grossest sort of plagiarism in writing *The Wandering Heir*. Nor is it justifiable to say that Collins' death prevented him from answering Reade: the controversy began in 1872, and Collins lived on until July 28, 1876, "in the prime of manhood and strength." These, and other misstatements of a less flagrant nature,⁴ all seem designed to whitewash Mortimer and his wife at Reade's expense. Even Merivale's seemingly kind remark—that Reade's generosity to Frances Collins was "his atonement for his haste"—clearly implies that Reade was acknowledging the injustice of his words and actions, whereas in reality he was acknowledging nothing of the kind: he was simply putting into practice his cherished belief in Christian forgiveness.

These are serious inaccuracies. Merivale, it would seem, was not merely an apologist for the Collinsses; he was relying heavily,

² Herman Merivale, "With the Majority," *Temple Bar*, LXXX (June, 1887), p. 184.

³ See Charles Reade's "Appendix to *The Wandering Heir*," Grolier ed., p. 185.

⁴ Merivale's entire version of the quarrel, as distinct from his version of the reconciliation, is inaccurate and misleading. Cf. the documentary evidence cited in Reade's "Appendix to *The Wandering Heir*."

perhaps entirely, on Frances Collins' version of the whole affair—⁵ and Frances, though ordinarily a reliable witness, apparently could not tell the whole truth when her own and her former husband's reputations were in jeopardy.

But once these partisan misrepresentations have been discounted, what remains can be accepted as reasonably accurate—including Merivale's entire description of the melodramatic part Reade played in the reconciliation. While some allowances should possibly be made for Merivale's own theatrical propensities, it is unlikely that he did any great violence to the facts in this one instance. Reade, like his "Resourceful Heroes," was Quixotic enough to play the humanitarian in exactly the way that has been described.

This sample of Reade's eccentric and extravagant kindness brings out a facet of his character that has not been sufficiently stressed. Though by nature quarrelsome and truculent, he always tried to regulate his conduct according to strict principles of Voltairean justice—and to temper these principles with the Evangelical Christianity he so constantly preached in all his novels.⁶ That he often failed to live up to these ideals goes without saying. Yet he always tried;⁷ and at times, as in the present instance, he completely conquered his pugnacity, and performed acts of charity and forgiveness that would do credit to the most righteous of his own fictional heroes.

WAYNE BURNS

*University of California
Berkeley, California*

⁵ See Merivale, *op. cit.*, pp. 181-182.

⁶ See also Charles Reade, *Bible Characters* (New York, 1889), *passim*.

⁷ What Reade says about Jonah in *Bible Characters* (pp. 70-76) is in many ways a commentary on his own personality and religious beliefs. He too was inclined to reply roughly (in answer to the precepts of "the Almighty") : "I do well to be angry, even unto death." Yet if he was, to use his own term, a thoroughgoing "egotist," he was, like Jonah, a "converted egotist"—one who, "when he came to think quietly over it all . . . yielded to Divine Instruction."

THE TERM SONNET SEQUENCE

Of all the short verse-forms popular in many languages from the Renaissance onward, probably none has received more attention from poets, readers and critics than has the sonnet. Though composed of a group of sonnets, the sonnet sequence, however, has rarely been defined.¹ As a prosodic term it has been considered either self-explanatory or something of a paradox.

The vast majority of early sonnets in Italian, French, and English are parts of collections or cycles. The Elizabethan poet who could not write a series of sonnets about the beauties of his mistress was indeed an unworthy lover and a parsimonious sonneteer. Wordsworth, the most prolific sonneteer among the major English poets, also grouped many of his sonnets around a central theme: *The River Duddon, Ecclesiastical Sonnets, Sonnets upon the Punishment of Death*. These Wordsworth called *Series*. The term *sonnet sequence*, however, seems to be a Victorian innovation. When Hall Caine was looking for a title for his anthology of sonnets which was later called *Sonnets of Three Centuries*, Rossetti wrote him a letter making several suggestions: "A Sonnet Sequence from Elder to Modern Work . . . would not be amiss." He then added: "Tell me if you think of using the title *A Sonnet Sequence*, as otherwise I might use it in the *House of Life*."²

Since the suggestion was not used by Hall Caine, Rossetti entitled *The House of Life* "a sonnet sequence" in the 1881 edition of his poems. From him the term was probably borrowed by Swinburne in *A Sequence of Sonnets on the Death of Robert Browning* and Wilfrid Scawen Blunt as a subtitle for three of his long verse-narratives: *A New Pilgrimage*, *Esther*, and *Natalia's Resurrection*. And thus it passed into current use among poets. Critics and editors also were quick to seize the term and apply it

¹ Mr. Houston Peterson remarks on this fact in his preface to *The Book of Sonnet Sequences* (New York, 1930). He does not, however, remark on the use of the term *sonnet sequence* nor offer any definition; but he does make pertinent comments about the variety of purposes to which sonnet groupings have been put.

² Hall Caine, *Recollections of Dante Gabriel Rossetti* (Boston, 1883), p. 244.

backwards in an indiscriminate sense to any and all previously written groups of sonnets. For all intents and purposes, *sonnet sequence* is now synonymous with *series* and *cycle* of sonnets.

Although one might prefer to apply the term to a specialized type of sonnet grouping, such would be unwise and far from practicable. It is obvious that Rossetti in his letter to Hall Caine conceived the term *sonnet sequence* in the loose sense of a chronological omnium-gatherum; but because it was applied to *The House of Life* instead of to Hall Caine's anthology, many of the Victorian poets used the term as applicable only to a closely unified group of sonnets. Such seems to be the theory of Wilfrid Scawen Blunt and John Addington Symonds, two of the most prolific writers of sonnet sequences among the Victorians. Blunt does not call either *The Love Sonnets of Proteus* or *In Vinculis* a sonnet sequence possibly because the sonnets are not so closely related as those in his other groups. In the preface to *Animi Figura* Symonds writes:

This book cannot claim strict unity of subject. Connecting links between its sonnet-sequences are wanting.⁸ Yet the fact that they are the product of one mind and deal with cognate problems, gives it a certain unity of tone. . . . Many of the sequences in *Animi Figura* exhibit a departure from [the general] rule by extending a single train of thought from one sonnet to another in such a wise that the point developed in a preceding sonnet is necessary to the comprehension of its successor . . .

Thus Symonds and Blunt both seem to think of the term *sonnet sequence* in a sense of specialized unification. And by obvious devices they frequently reduce the sonnets to verse-stanzas.

On the other hand, Swinburne's *A Sequence of Sonnets on the Death of Robert Browning* can be read in almost any order. And in this same tradition W. H. Auden in a recent group of twenty sonnets called *The Quest* employs the subtitle "A Sonnet Sequence." Each of the twenty has a title of its own and is clearly understandable in its own right. But if the individual sonnets are read in the sequence suggested by the poet, many take on an added significance that may not be apparent to one who reads the sonnets at random. This unity within a larger unity is the unique feature of the sonnet sequence whether it be a narrative like Meredith's *Modern Love* and William Ellery Leonard's *Two Lives and A Man*

⁸ In fact, seven of the sequences had appeared in earlier volumes, *Many Moods* and *New and Old*.

Against Time or a group of lyrics of subtly changing moods like Rossetti's *The House of Life* and Robert Bridges' *The Growth of Love*.

Aside from a general unity that the term *sequence* implies, to many poets *sonnet sequence* has indicated a sonnet-stanza while to others it has meant little more than a synonym for the older terms *cycle* and *series*. In short, much of the confusion and loose use was implicit in the manner of Rossetti's conception of the term and in its subsequent spread among the Victorian poets.

WILLIAM T. GOING

University of Alabama

CASAL'S *SALOMÉ*: THE MYSTERY OF THE MISSING PROPHET

In all the history of that curious nineteenth century artistic development, the *transposition d'art*, one of the most interesting literary phenomena is the series of sonnets entitled *Mi museo ideal*, by the Cuban poet, Julián del Casal. As every student of Spanish-American literature knows, Casal was inspired to write his poems by the publication, in *La Habana Elegante*, of several reproductions of the paintings of the French artist, Gustave Moreau. On the theme of Moreau's paintings, Casal composed ten sonnets: *Salomé*, *La aparición*, *Prometeo*, *Galatea*, *Elena*, *Hércules ante la Hidra*, *Vénus Anadyómena*, *Una peri*, *Júpiter y Europa*, and *Hércules y las Estinfárides*.¹

Besides being an interesting case of *transposition d'art*, these poems are a landmark in the development of the Modernist movement in Spanish America. They are one of the earliest attempts to adapt to Spanish poetry the detached, objective, impassive technique of the French Parnassian school. As such, they were a definite contribution to the renovation of literary values which characterized the epoch in America.

One of the most beautiful and most nearly perfect of these sonnets is the one entitled *Salomé*. A curious esthetic problem has

¹ Julián del Casal, *Poesías completas*, Recopilación, ensayo preliminar, bibliografía y notas de Mario Cabrera Saqui, La Habana, Publicaciones del Ministerio de Educación, Dirección de Cultura, 1945, pp. 166-175.

been posed by Professor Alfred Coester concerning this poem. In his anthology of the Modernist movement, still, after more than twenty years, the best introduction to this phase of Spanish-American letters,² Mr. Coester comments on the poem as follows:

The Biblical account is found in Mark vi, 16-29, according to which Salome after her dance, at the instigation of her mother Herodias, asked for the head of John the Baptist. In Moreau's painting Salome is represented as faltering in the dance frightened by the apparition of a head dripping blood. This detail, despite its importance, did not interest Casal.³

One wonders why the apparition did not interest Casal. What is the mystery of the missing prophet? What esthetic criterion was involved on the poet's part? Was it a willful distortion of the subject owing to a certain aversion to this disagreeable feature of the painting? The poems have all the earmarks of being an exact and literal translation into words of the pictorial image. Why should Casal fail even to mention what must evidently be, not a detail, but the central figure, or one of two central figures upon which the interest of the painting is focused? The problem becomes doubly perplexing when one recalls Rubén Darío's statement that Moreau himself recognized his painting perfectly from the Cuban's poem.⁴

Despite the speculations raised by Mr. Coester's statement, the problem is not really one of esthetic interpretation, however. It is rather a question of the correct identification of Casal's source. At this distance from Cuba it is impossible to consult *La Habana Elegante* in order to compare the poem with the reproduction of the painting. Even in Cuba the periodical appears difficult of access and, even so, incomplete.⁵ There has recently come to the writer's hand, however, a volume which clears up the mystery. Jean Laran,

² *An Anthology of the Modernista Movement in Spanish America*, Boston, Ginn and Company, [1924].

³ P. 237, note to p. 28.

⁴ Cited by Roberto Meza Fuentes, *De Díaz Mirón a Rubén Darío*, Santiago de Chile, 1940, p. 102.

⁵ Esperanza Figueroa, in an article on Casal, makes the following statement: "Es muy probable que haya escrito para los primeros números de *La Habana Elegante*, pero la colección más completa que nos fué dable revisar, perteneciente al Doctor Julio Hernández Miyares, comienza en el año 1885." ("Apuntes sobre Julián del Casal," in *Revista Iberoamericana*, 1944 (vii, No. 14), p. 332.)

in his *Gustave Moreau*,⁶ reproduces three paintings by the French artist on the Salome theme: *Salomé*, *L'Apparition*, and *Salomé au jardin*, together with a sketch for the first, *Salomé (Esquisse)*.⁷ In addition there exist "innumerable studies" for the Salome paintings.⁸

L'Apparition and *Salomé au jardin* both contain the figure of the Prophet's severed head, and Mr. Coester's comment evidently refers to the former. *L'Apparition*, moreover, was the source of Casal's *La aparición*, in which the poet does not hesitate to describe the head dripping blood. A glance at the painting entitled simply *Salomé* (the same title used by Casal) shows unmistakably that this, not *L'Apparition*, was the Cuban's source. Moreau omitted the apparition from this painting, and Casal, as we should expect him to do, transfers the pictorial image faithfully to the printed page. Other details of the poem make this abundantly clear. Salome holds in her right hand a flower (Casal calls it a lotus) which does not appear in *L'Apparition*. The poet refers to the dancer's "veste de brocado estrellada de ardiente pedrería," an exact description of her appearance in *Salomé*, whereas in *L'Apparition* she is scantily clad. Just as telling is the feeling of the spaciousness and height of the incense-filled palace apparent in both Moreau's *Salomé* and in the first quatrain of the Cuban's sonnet, and just as clearly lacking in both *L'Apparition* and its corresponding poem.

JOHN KENNETH LESLIE

Northwestern University

⁶ *L'Art de notre temps. Gustave Moreau. 48 planches hors-texte accompagnées de quarante-huit notices rédigées par Jean Laran et précédées d'une introduction de Léon Deshairs.* Paris, Librairie Centrale des Beaux-arts, n.d.

⁷ Pp. 71-78. Laran locates the originals as follows: *Salomé* in the Collection Mante, *L'Apparition* in the Luxembourg, *Salomé au jardin* in the collection of the Countess Greffulhe, and the *Salomé (Esquisse)* in the Musée Gustave Moreau.

⁸ Laran, p. 73, a propos of the reproduction of the *esquisse*, declares: "Parmi les innombrables études accumulées en vue du tableau dès 1874, il est bien difficile de faire un choix, car chacune résume d'ingénieuses et instructives recherches."

GAVARNI AND THE GONCOURTS' HENRIETTE
MARÉCHAL

The first attempts of the Goncourts in aesthetic self-expression were made in water-color drawings and not in the written word. Their metamorphosis from the plastic to the verbal image was accomplished by way of the theater which was to them a living fusion of the pictorial and the literary arts:

Sur une grande table à modèle aux deux bouts de laquelle, du matin à la tombée du jour, mon frère et moi faisions de l'aquarelle dans un obscur entresol de la rue Saint-Georges, un soir de l'automne de l'année 1850, en ces heures où la lumière de la lampe met fin aux lavis de couleur,—poussés je ne sais par quelle inspiration,—nous nous mettions à écrire ensemble un vaudeville, avec un pinceau trempé dans de l'encre de Chine.¹

One of the first dramatic fragments of the Goncourts was written at the time when they had just met the great lithographer, Gavarni, whom they had admired for many years. The three men were contributors to the literary review *L'Eclair* in which Edmond and Jules published their playlet *La Nuit de Saint-Sylvestre* which was undoubtedly inspired by a print of Gavarni: "L'artiste a donné à *L'Illustration* une *Nuit de Saint-Sylvestre* qui est une vraie merveille dans ce genre d'ingénieuse fantaisie."² When this early dramatic effort of the two ambitious brothers was refused by the producers, Edmond expressed their dejection by quoting a "légende" by their beloved Gavarni: "'Enfoncés!', dit l'un de nous à l'autre avec cet affaissement moral qu'a si bien peint Gavarni dans l'écrasement de ce jeune homme tombé sur la chaise d'une cellule de Clichy."³

¹ Edmond and Jules de Goncourt, *Henriette Maréchal*, Préface, Paris, Charpentier, 1879, p. 1.

² Edmond and Jules de Goncourt, *Gavarni, l'homme et l'œuvre*, Paris, Flammarion, 1924, p. 88.

³ Edmond and Jules de Goncourt, *Henriette Maréchal*, Préface, p. 9. The lithograph referred to is number 1 in the series called *Clichy*, described in the following way in Armelhault and Bocher: *L'Œuvre de Gavarni*, Paris, Librairie des Bibliophiles, 1873, No. 429: "'Enfoncé!!!'—Un jeune homme qu'on vient d'écraser est assis de 3/4 tourné à gauche en travers d'une chaise, dans une cellule, l'air hébété, son chapeau en arrière de la

Ten years later, in 1863, when the Goncourts wrote their most important dramatic work, *Henriette Maréchal*, they were strongly under the influence of Gavarni who had become their most intimate friend. The first act of the play, *Le Bal de l'Opéra*, can be considered a series of Gavarni prints brought to life, the rapid succession of hundreds⁴ of black and white and colored lithographs.⁵

The *Préface* to the 1879 edition of *Henriette Maréchal* contains a succinct condensation of the Goncourts' attitude toward their most ambitious and daring attempt in the theater: ". . . dans cette pièce ressemblante à toutes les pièces du monde, il n'y a jamais eu pour nous qu'un acte original et bien personnel à nous: le Bal masqué."⁶

How did the Goncourts come to include the scene of the masked ball in their play and what was Gavarni's part in its inspiration and evolution? There are few episodes in the Goncourts' life and work which lend themselves as well as this one to a detailed analysis of literary transformation.

There are two main sources for the masked ball scene in *Henriette Maréchal*: the first is in the prints of Gavarni which we have already referred to; the second is in the visit which Edmond and Jules made with Gavarni to the Bal de l'Opéra in February 1860. The literary accounts of this visit, which the Goncourts incorporated into three of their major works, represent three progressive stages in the psychological (but not chronological) transition from reality to pure fiction. The first version is a section from the *Journal*, a straightforward account of what the three friends saw and did:

Samedi, 4 février (1860).—Gavarni vient dîner. Il a fait la grande tête, les mains dans les poches de son pantalon. Derrière lui un matelas jeté sur le pied d'un lit, avec des draps pliés."

⁴ Among the several hundred works of Gavarni dealing with the "bal masqué," one should list at least:

Le Bal Masqué, A. & B. 347; *Les Débardeurs*, A. & B. 486-542; *L'Ecole des Pierrots*, A. & B. 1278-1281; *La Foire aux Amours*, A. & B. 1292-1301; *Pierrot*, A. & B. 2106; *Un Episode au Bal Masqué*, A. & B. 2182; *Au Bal*, A. & B. 2184; *Bal de l'Opéra*, A. & B. 2389; *Nouveaux Travestissements*, A. & B. 2509-2586; *En Débardeurs*, A. & B. 2691; *Rencontre au Bal*, A. & B. 2693; *Le Bal Masqué*, A. & B. 2703.

⁵ A similar experiment in the theater was carried out very successfully by Enrique Granados in his opera, *Goyescas*.

⁶ Edmond and Jules de Goncourt, *op. cit.*, *Préface*, p. xvi.

partie d'aller au bal de l'Opéra avec nous. En arrivant, il demande une feuille de papier et y dépose de petites machines mathématiques, qui lui sont venues en route. Pour attraper l'heure du bal, nous l'emmènons voir Léotard, et, après le Cirque, nous allons prendre un grog dans un café des boulevards, où il nous parle avec une admiration enthousiaste des travaux de Biot, de ses livres de mathématiques où il n'y a pas de figures.

Et le voici, montant cet escalier du bal de l'Opéra, qu'il n'a pas vu depuis quinze ans, le voici à mon bras, perdu dans cette foule, comme un roi perdu dans son royaume: lui, Gavarni, qui pourrait dire: 'Le Carnaval, c'est moi!'

Il vient jeter les yeux sur les modes nouvelles de la mascarade. Nous restons une heure à regarder, d'une loge, la danse et les masques, une heure où il semble faire une sérieuse étude du costume nouveau et presque général des danseuses: de ce costume de bébé,⁷ de cette petite robe-blouse descendant au genou, laissant voir la jambe et les hautes bottines ballantes dans l'air, et dessinant des nimbes au-dessus de la tête des danseurs. Puis quand il a tout le bal dans les yeux, je le ramène coucher chez nous. Il a eu froid en sortant du Cirque, puis la chaleur du bal l'a suffoqué. Il se traîne en marchant, il monte notre escalier lentement, et nous confie, au coin de notre feu, qu'en sortant du bal de l'Opéra, il ne pouvait mettre un pied devant l'autre.

Et il se couche, nous faisant de son lit, avant de s'endormir, de charmantes plaisanteries enfantines et qu'il sait si bien faire, sur le bal et les folies que nous aurions pu y faire.⁸

The Goncourts later developed this event, which they had sought to bring about, into a "tranche" of naturalistic biography in *Gavarni, l'homme et l'œuvre*, and, still further fictionalized, into the pivotal chapter of their novel, *Charles Demainly*, in which Gavarni becomes the artist Giroust.

One cannot doubt that this constant preoccupation with the masked ball had its origin in the Goncourts' close association with Gavarni and that from his temperament, so sympathetic to their own, they drew the first act of *Henriette Maréchal*.

In the same way that one can feel the presence of Gavarni in the "dominos" and the "débardeurs" on the stage, so one can sense his personality in the dialogue of the masked ball scene. The Goncourts' imitation of the style of Gavarni's "légendes" is always original, individualistic, and the actual points of contact are rare and so ephemeral that they easily slip through one's fingers. Yet they exist and we can point out several of them. As the play begins,

⁷ The Goncourts used this costume for Scene 4 of Act I in *Henriette Maréchal*.

⁸ Edmond and Jules de Goncourt, *Journal*, I, 310.

a lady coming down the staircase at the right speaks to a masked dancer: "Oh! Monsieur, tu me chiffonnes! (Apercevant un vieux monsieur endormi sur une banquette auprès de l'escalier) Gendarme! arrêtez monsieur: il dort!"⁹

Then there is a "Masque, en postillon, arrivant à cheval sur une banquette,"¹⁰ who is reminiscent of Gavarni's "postillon" in *Les Débardeurs*, VIII:

... Dans un couloir au bal de l'Opéra, un débardeur, son chapeau à la main, se moquant d'un homme frêle et mal bâti, costumé en postillon et vu de dos à gauche, donnant le bras à une grande femme ayant un loup sur le visage; sur le mur à droite, écrit directement: Premières Loges.¹¹

The most effective scene in the first act is the fifth one in which the light touch of Jules de Goncourt, his poetic languor, his tender nostalgia, and his sympathetic humor, are subtly blended:

Un Monsieur, en habit noir et en cravate blanche à la galerie du balcon: "... Savez-vous de quoi vous me faites l'effet d'ici, mes enfants? d'un magasin de rubans dans une hotte de chiffonier, sauf le respect que je vous dois! Vous avez l'air d'un feu d'artifice dans un ruisseau, parole d'honneur! Ah ça! Pierrots que vous êtes, vous êtes encore pas mal serins! Comment! vous êtes la fleur de Paris, et voilà comme vous représentez le peuple le plus spirituel de la terre, la gaieté française, le vin de champagne! Mais saperlotte! ayez au moins l'air de vous amuser! Dites des bêtises . . . des bêtises qui ont déjà servi . . . ça ne fait rien . . . (Se penchant vers une femme à côté de lui.) On ne demande pas du neuf ici, n'est-ce pas, Madame?¹² — Allons! un peu de train! Vous n'avez plus que jusqu'à demain matin, malheureux! A six heures le carnaval¹³ est enfoncé, le carême vous remet la main sur le collet, et il pleut de la neige sur les gens trop gris! Un an, mes petits biches, un an avant de me revoir!¹⁴

Certain of the purists among the Goncourt's friends never ap-

⁹ Edmond and Jules de Goncourt, *op. cit.*, p. 34. There is perhaps a connection with Gavarni's *Ecole des Pierrots*, VII: "Le Sommeil de l'innocence": "... dans un bal, un pierrot assis et dormant profondément, son masque relevé sur le front, des lunettes sur le nez; près de lui, à droite, une femme en canotier." — A. & B. 1769.

¹⁰ Edmond and Jules de Goncourt, *op. cit.*, p. 35.

¹¹ A. & B. 493.

¹² One is reminded once more of Gavarni's *Carnaval*, XXIII: "Qu'est-ce que tu peux venir chercher par ici, philosophe? — Je ramasse toutes vos vieilles blagues d'amour, mes colombes: on en refait du neuf." — A. & B. 1046.

¹³ There are fifty lithographs in Gavarni's series "Le Carnaval"; A. & B. 1024-1068; 1705-1708; 2223.

¹⁴ Edmond and Jules de Goncourt, *op. cit.*, pp. 50-51.

proved of the popular element in Gavarni's "légendes"; among them was Flaubert who wrote to George Sand in December 1870: ". . . Je donnerais toutes les légendes de Gavarni pour certaines expressions et coupes des maîtres comme 'l'ombre était nuptiale, auguste et solennelle,' de Victor Hugo."¹⁵ But others, like Théophile Gautier, who wrote the Prologue for *Henriette Maréchal*, and Alphonse Daudet were extremely enthusiastic. It was Daudet who first recognized the Goncourts' contribution (and Gavarni's share in it) to a new conception of drama that was vaguely beginning to take shape:

. . . Et ce premier acte au bal de l'Opéra, cette foule, ces masques blaguant et hurlant, ces poursuites, ces engueulades, ce parti pris de réalité et de vie, ironique et réel comme un Gavarni, n'était-ce pas, quinze ans avant que le mot 'naturalisme' fût inventé, le naturalisme au théâtre?¹⁶

On the other hand, the first act of *Henriette Maréchal* is in many ways not realistic drama: ". . . pas si réelle qu'on a bien voulu dire . . .", as Edmond de Goncourt himself says in the preface. It is, rather, a delightful bit of poetic fantasy, an escape into the Gavarni-created whirl of Carnaval gayety. No critic has transferred into more poignant and more evocative words its evanescent spirit than the distinguished Uruguayan author, Victor Pérez Petit, in his superlative study on the Goncourts:

No hay en toda la obra ese sello característico y firme del naturalismo; el asunto está tratado *poéticamente*, sin asomos de copia, de reproducción de la realidad, con ligeros esbozos, con perfiles esfumados de acuarela, con relieves, morbideces e irisaciones artísticas dignas del ensueño de un poeta; y en cuanto a los personajes, cabe hacer notar que más que seres humanos parecen seres espirituales, aéreos, poéticos, vestidos de nieblas o de resplandores, y fabricados 'con lo falso y con lo sublime.' El primer acto es una verdadera fantasmagoría, un cuadro deslumbrador, cuya vida es vida de ensueño, ligera, vaporosa, cuajada de puntitos de oro y de escintilaciones de estrella. Rueda silente, encantador, como una nube preñada de auroras. Y no hay más.¹⁷

DAVID JAMES

Brown University

¹⁵ Gustave Flaubert, *Correspondance*, Paris, Librairie de France, 1924, III, 629.

¹⁶ Alphonse Daudet, *Souvenirs d'un Homme de Lettres*, Paris, Marpon et Flammarion, 1888, p. 150.

¹⁷ Victor Pérez Petit, *Las Tres Catedrales del Naturalismo*, Montevideo, 1943, p. 251. (Obras completas, vol v.)

MALLARMÉ AND BRYANT

Poe was not the only American poet to attract the attention of French writers of the nineteenth century. Whitman was widely read toward the close of the century; even Longfellow was known. It was pointed out long since that a sonnet of Baudelaire, *Le Guignon*, contains an easily recognizable imitation of certain familiar lines of *A Psalm of Life*. Heretofore, however, evidence to show that William Cullen Bryant was known to French poets has been lacking. It is possible, nevertheless, that Stéphane Mallarmé borrowed one of his strikingly beautiful images from the author of *Thanatopsis*.

One of Mallarmé's early poems, "Las de l'amer repos où ma paresse offense," ends with a series of images of great distinction, dazzling yet delicate. Among the finest is this in the last verse:

Non loin de trois grand cils d'émeraude, roseaux . . .

Now comparisons of eyes to streams, pools or lakes are quite common in poetry, but the use of the detail given here: the association of eyelashes to reeds by water's brink apparently needed a nineteenth-century poet, with his awareness of the beauties of wild nature. Bryant compared eyelashes to reeds in the fourth stanza of "Oh fairest of the rural maids":

Thine eyes are springs in whose serene
And silent waters heaven is seen;
Their lashes are the herbs that look
On their young figures in the brook . . .

The connection here would seem very slight, very inconclusive, were it not for the fact that Mallarmé had already used the same image, but in more extended form, in a poem written two years earlier. "Las de l'amer repos" appeared in the *Parnasse contemporain* of 1866. According to Dr. Bonniot, Mallarmé's son-in-law, an early and much less obscure version of the obscure sonnet *Le Pitre châtié* (which was not published until 1887) had been written in 1864.¹ In this version, the first two verses are as follows:

¹ See *Revue de France* of April 1929, where the early version is given. It was found, dated 1864, in a notebook of Mallarmé's in Dr. Bonniot's possession.

Pour ses yeux—pour nager dans ces lacs, dont les quais
Sont plantés de beaux cils qu'un matin bleu pénètre . . .

One might conjecture that Mallarmé, having used in a published poem, "Las de l'amer repos," the image of eyelashes as reeds, decided, when revising *Le Pitre châtié*, that once was enough. In any case the elaborate image of the first two verses of the early *Pitre châtié* was reduced to two words: "Yeux, lacs. . . ."

Is the similarity in imagery that we have noted merely coincidental or can we allege that Mallarmé was definitely inspired by Bryant? If we could demonstrate that the French symbolist had read and appreciated the work of the American poet, we could make such an allegation with some confidence. Unfortunately, we have no evidence to that effect. It is true that Mallarmé studied to prepare himself to teach English, but it is hardly likely that Bryant would have been one of the authors in his program. It is possible, through Poe, however, to establish an admittedly somewhat tenuous connection between Mallarmé and Bryant.

It is well-known that from the age of twenty on Mallarmé's admiration for Poe was great and constant. The autobiographical sketch that he wrote for Verlaine at the time of *Les Poètes maudits* (1884) stated that at the age of twenty he learned English simply "pour mieux lire Poe."² Would his interest in Poe have included Poe's critical essays and reviews? One might well imagine that Mallarmé would have been curious to see what were Poe's opinions about other American poets. He would have discovered that Poe judged Bryant with some severity, but that he admired one poem of Bryant's very highly. That poem was "Oh fairest of the rural maids."

Poe wrote three critical estimates of Bryant's poetry: the first in 1837 in the *Southern Literary Messenger*, the second in 1840 in *Burton's Gentleman's Magazine*, and the third in 1846 in *Godey's Magazine and Lady's Book*. In all three of these articles "Oh fairest of the rural maids" is given high praise; in the first the poem is quoted in its entirety, and the first two verses of the stanza quoted above are singled out for special praise. Only the third of these studies, however, was reprinted before 1864,³ hence

² See E. Noulet, *L'Œuvre poétique de Stéphane Mallarmé*, Paris, 1940, p. 9.

³ In the third volume of the Griswold edition (the volume entitled "The Literati") : New York, 1850, pp. 178-88.

it is likely that only this third study would have been available to Mallarmé. Here is the statement he would have found there with regard to the poem in question:

"Oh, Fairest of the Rural Maids!" will strike every poet as the truest poem written by Bryant. It is richly ideal.⁴

It is not hard to picture the young Mallarmé, impressed by Poe's praise and agreeing wholeheartedly with Poe's conception of what a true poem was, seeking out a volume of Bryant's poems, and reading and being moved by a poem well calculated to appeal to a young poet and a young lover.⁵

HENRY A. GRUBBS

Oberlin College

CHATEAUBRIAND DID NOT MEET WASHINGTON

It has been generally supposed, in the absence of proof to the contrary, that Chateaubriand's account of his interview with Washington, in the *Mémoires d'Outre-Tombe*, is an authentic report. However, in the recent Bicentennial Edition of the Writings of George Washington, xxxi (1939), 355, appears the following letter from Washington to Charles Armand Tuffin:

Philadelphia, Sept. 5, 1791. Dear Sir: I have had the pleasure to receive your letter of the 22d of March last. Being indisposed on the day when Monsieur de Combourg called to deliver your letter I did not see him, and I understood that he set off for Niagara on the next day.

Unless, then, we suppose that Washington forgot his meeting with young Chateaubriand, or that, for some mysterious diplomatic reason, he lied about it, we must accept that Chateaubriand's vivid account of his conversation with the great man was a total fabrication.

MORRIS BISHOP

Cornell University

⁴ *Complete Works of Edgar Allan Poe*, New York, 1902 (Monticello Edition), XIII, 134.

⁵ It should be pointed out that Mallarmé got married in England in the spring of 1863, about the time he might have been reading Poe and Bryant. It was at about this period that he wrote the ethereal, gentle, sweetly-sentimental *Apparition*, not too different in tone from "Oh fairest of the rural maids."

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE ON MME DE VILLEDIEU

This note is intended to offer addenda and corrections to bibliographical information furnished by two scholarly works on Mme de Villedieu: Emile Magne, *Madame de Villedieu (Hortense Des Jardins) 1632-1692*, Paris, 1907 and Bruce Archer Morrissette, *The Life and Works of Marie-Catherine Desjardins (Mme de Villedieu) 1632-1683*, Saint Louis, 1947.

Two years after 11 of Mlle Desjardin's poems had appeared in the *Recueil* of Sercy in 1660, Barbin published her first *Recueil de poésies*, containing 6 of the Sercy edition. Magne and Morrissette list an edition by Barbin in 1664 augmented by 6 poems, and another in the same year by Quinet, under the title, *Œuvres de Mlle Desjardins*, containing, in addition to the poems of the second Barbin edition, *le Carrousel de Mgr le Dauphin*, *Manlius* and *Nitetus* (found in the Library of Congress as well as in the Bibliothèque Nationale and the Bibliothèque de Versailles). One must add another edition, made the same year by Sercy, under the title, *Recueil de Poesies de Mademoiselle Desjardins. Augmenté de plusieurs Pièces & Lettres en cette dernière Edition . . . Avec Privilege du Roy* (copy at Universities of Iowa and Minnesota). It was composed of 7 letters, in prose and verse, several madrigaux and sonnets, 5 eclogues and 2 elegies. Curiously enough, the *privilège* indicates that Barbin, having received it Feb. 5, 1662, "en avait fait part" to Charles de Sercy and to Gabriel Quinet. One hardly sees the efficacy of a *privilège* which allows 3 competing editions in the same year! Barbin was, of course, not averse to publishing when a *privilège* no longer belonged to him. Likewise both Barbin and Ribou printed the *Novveau Recueil de quelques Pièces Galantes* (Ribou spelling) in 1669, the *privilège* granted to Barbin for *les Lettres en forme de Relations* being reproduced by Ribou. The Ribou edition, not listed by Magne, is found in the University of Minnesota. The same sort of thing happened with the play, *Manlius*. The *privilège* was issued to Barbin Sept. 28, 1662, and he published an edition that year, yet he ceded his rights to Gabriel Quinet and he in turn to Guillaume de Luyne; this latter published the play the same year (not listed by Magne, copy at Harvard University). The reverse occurred with *Nitetus*, printed

by Quinet in 1664 (really 1663, the *achevé* being Dec. 19), a copy of which is found at the University of Iowa; Barbin published it also in 1664, Quinet having "fait part du privilège à Claude Barbin." A copy of the rare play, *le Favory*, Paris, Thomas Iolly, 1665, is owned by the Williams College Library. Various editions of the *Récit en prose et en vers de la Farce des précieuses* are found in libraries of this country (Harvard, Boston, City of New York, Indiana, Iowa, Minnesota, Library of Congress).

The edition of *le Jaloux par force . . . Ensemble la Chambre de Justice de l'Amour; Avec la Revue des Troupes d'Amour*, purported to have been made by Pierre Bon-temps at Fribourch (*sic*) in 1668, is evidently a *contrefaçon*, the Elzevierien sphere being imitated on the title page.¹ It was printed possibly in Paris or in Holland. Only the last title is certainly by our author, as it is signed "Des Jardins" (copy in Harvard Library). An English prose translation of the first, under the title, *The Husband forc'd to be Jealous . . .* appeared in London the same year (University of Minnesota, where it is ascribed to Mme de Villedieu). Morrissette considers Donneau de Visé its author (*op. cit.*, p. 65).

The edition by Dominique Desclassan (*sic*, misspelled by Magne and Morrissette) in Toulouse in 1702 of *les Annales galantes. Par M^e de Ville-Dieu, . . . avec permission* (not given!), found in the Library of Congress, offers an interesting problem. It begins with a *dédicace* to Monseigneur de Lionne, which is not in the edition of 1700 at The Hague (copy of this last at Harvard), and which declares that de Lionne does not know the author!² The *avant-propos*, however, is identical in the two, except for 3 minor details and 2 typographical errors; the omission of a line in the Hague edition makes a *contre-sens*. In the *table des matières*, the division into *parties* is different. The interesting thing is the text; in the Toulouse edition, it has no connection with the *table*, and is in fact the 7 stories of *les Amours des grands hommes*, as indeed is indicated by the running title, thus constituting an edition of this work not before listed and testifying to its popularity in the provinces, another edition having appeared in Lyons in 1696. It

¹ For the authentic Elzevierien spheres, see Gustaf Berghman, *Etudes sur la bibliographie elzevierienne . . .*, Stockholm, 1885.

² "Ce n'est point un Auteur fameux qui prend la liberté de vous présenter cet Ouvrage . . . Je ne vous diray point, Monseigneur, qui est l'Auteur de cette Mascarade . . ."

is followed in the same volume by *Portrait des foiblesses humaines. Par Mme de Ville-Dieu. A Toulouse, chés Dominique Desclassan, seul Imprimeur Juré de l'Université. M.DCCII. Avec Permission* (permission not given). Although there is a new title-page, the pagination is continuous (p. 341-433), this being likewise an unlisted edition of this work.³ Was Desclassan playing on the success 2 years earlier of *les Annales galantes*, or was he avoiding copyright difficulties, his *permission* undoubtedly being mythical, when he furnished a false title-page to his printing of *les Amours des grands hommes* and neglected entirely to include on it the second work contained in the volume? At any rate, let us not question his integrity, as he was none less than the "seul Imprimeur juré de l'Université de Toulouse." Besides indicating the *laisser-aller* of printers of his day, his edition proves again Mme de Villedieu's popularity outside of Paris. Without being aware of this combination edition, Morrissette keenly noted the close relationship in style, technique and conception of the two works, *le Portrait* appearing almost as a sequel to *les Amours*.

The date of the *édition princeps* of *les Désordres de l'amour* is important because of its relations to *la Princesse de Clèves*. Morrissette is in error in stating (p. 101, n. 52) that Magne's bibliography gives 1676 as its date. In fact, he gives 1670, but after further research he averred in a conversation with Miss Dorothy Dallas⁴ that he was then convinced that the edition of 1675, chez Barbin, in 4 volumes, of which he possessed the third, is the original. Desclassan made an edition in Toulouse in 1702 (copy in the Bibliothèque Nationale), and a copy of the English translation of the last story, printed in 1677 in London, entitled, *The Disorders of Love . . .*, is to be had at Harvard Library.

Morrissette mentions a copy of the *rarissime Anaxandre*, Ribou, 1667 in the Library of Congress; there is also one in the University of Iowa, bound with other works of Villedieu. Magne was unable in 1907 to determine the first edition of *le Portefeuille*. Morrissette places it late in 1674 or in 1675, thanks to a reference in *le Portefeuille* itself (*Oeuvres*, t. II, p. 63), as news of the day, to

³ It appears identical to the spurious edition of Amsterdam of 1686 (Library of Congress, Toinet Collection), except for the omission of the last paragraph, where one reads: "Mais passons à notre seconde partie."

⁴ Cf. her work, *le Roman français de 1660 à 1680*, Paris, 1932, p. 189, n. 1.

Chapelain's death, which occurred Feb. 22, 1674.⁵ In the same sentence one reads that "Mlle Marin épousa *hier* votre aimable parent." Evidently both events were strictly contemporary; this would indicate the publication early in 1674, rather than late in 1674 or in 1675. Morrissette presumes that Mme de Villedieu did not write the promised sequel to *les Galanteries grenadines* because the novel did not please the public (p. 176). It seems rather a trick of her feminine capriciousness, which often led her to begin a new work instead of fulfilling the promise to complete an unfinished one. In fact *les Galanteries grenadines* enjoyed 3 editions in quick succession. Magne lists the Barbin edition of 1673 as the first, but Barbin really produced it the preceding year (copy at the Library of Congress). The inevitable *contrefaçon* appeared also in 1673, marked Bruxelles (édition Elzevier Willem), and a fourth came out 38 years later in Lyons. All of this is indicative of a very considerable popularity. Mme de Villedieu's competition in the Moorish field mentioned by Morrissette came 2 and 11 years after the first appearance of *les Galanteries grenadines*, and may even be indicative of the latter's vogue. Twice Morrissette seems to have misread Magne (p. 161, n. 22 and p. 169), where he presumes that Barbin printed an edition of *les Amours des grands hommes* in 1671 and one of *les Exilez de la cour d'Auguste* in 1675; in both cases it is a question of an Elzevierien edition "Sur la copie à Paris chez Cl. Barbin."

Morrissette regretted not having access to the separate edition of *Carmente*, Barbin, 1668, one of her rare novels to run through only one edition, containing an interesting *avis* not reproduced in the collected works. There is however a copy in Cornell University, and it is most intriguing, because of manuscript notes which fill the *feuilles de garde* of the 2 volumes. Their author traces Mme de Villedieu's life, speaks of her 2 marriages, of her flirtations, cites and refutes Voltaire's criticism of her literary merits in his *Siecle de Louis XIV*,⁶ admiring especially *Manlius* and certain poetry. He points out the fact that Simas is an imitation of La Fontaine's *Faucon*, another link between the two writers which, I believe, has not been mentioned before. The dramatic circumstances surrounding the death of Palans he calls "un des plus beaux traits qu'on

⁵ Morrissette, *op. cit.*, p. 132, n. 43 and p. 133.

⁶ This places the writing of these manuscript notes after 1751.

voye Dans les romans." He finds the reference to Homer and the *Iliad* a "furieux anachronisme," as Evandre and Carmante lived 60 years after the Trojan War: "On voit par là que le roman est l'ouvrage d'une femme qui ne s'inquiétait guerre (*sic*) de la chronologie." In the second volume, he finds other anachronisms, notably (2^e partie, livre 1), Archimède, who lived 1000 years after the action of the story, and he complains that *les Exiles* is not finished: "il en faudrait encore au moins autant pour terminer l'ouvrage." He blames the author because the fate of Myris, aunt of Cyparis, is left uncertain: "C'est . . . une faute, car il faut qu'on sache le sort de tous les personnages dont on a fait mention Dans le cours de l'ouvrage." He points out an inconsistency when Timoleon, who had accompanied the queen to the hamlet of Ligée, without leaving her, is found the next day in the king's suite as he comes to rejoin the queen: "fautes d'attention de l'auteur qui travaillait à la hâte ne prenant pas la peine de revoir & de corriger ses nombreuses productions." All these commentaries, with numerous corrections of typographical errors in the text, testify to the very careful perusal by at least one reader, probably of the following century, of one of the least successful of Mme de Villedieu's novels. These manuscript notes mention an edition of *les Désordres de l'amour* not known to bibliographers, in 4 parties and 2 volumes, published in Lyons, in 1686 (the last figure difficult to decipher). A carefully established *table des matières* is written in another hand.

Finally, it would require long, patient research to settle definitely the question of authorship of 6 or 7 works which are frequently assigned to Mme de Villedieu. For example, Morissette discredits entirely the attribution of *les Nouvelles chinoises* to "Mlle de Villedieu," as indicated on its title-page in the Baritel edition of 1712 at Lyons (copy at Harvard Library, acquired in 1944), but his arguments lose all their weight when we observe that this is not, as he supposes, the first edition.⁷ In fact, the title-page contains also the notation, "Augmentez (*sic*) en cette édition." It has the marks of an early work, being a collection of lively adventures recounted with great verve. A persistent search for its first printing, not to be found at the Bibliothèque Nationale nor listed by Emile Magne, might settle definitely the question of authorship. In general the problem with Mme de Villedieu is complicated by the fact that her style does not distinguish her unquestionably from

⁷ Morissette, *op. cit.*, pp. 188-9.

other secondary contemporary writers, and because publishers had the annoying habit of printing anonymously in the same volume works by various authors. That several novels were attributed to her indicates her popularity as does the increasingly large number of editions, legitimate and spurious, of her known productions which we have discovered in Paris, in the provinces, in Holland and Belgium, and in English translation in London.

MARY ELIZABETH STORER

Beloit College

MADAME DE VILLEDIEU AND THE ACADEMY OF THE RICOVRATI

In his scholarly work on Mme de Villedieu, Bruce Morissette raises the question as to whether this French writer was really invited to become a member of the Italian Academy of the Ricovrati.¹ He reproduces information furnished to Emile Magne² in letters dated Dec. 6 and Dec. 11, 1906 from the then secretary of the Reale Accademia di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti of Padua (an out-growth of the Ricovrati), wherein "la Signora des Houlières de Chate" and two other French women were listed in the Giornale dell' Accademia as members of the Ricovrati on Sept. 14, 1684, the word *de Chate* having been added by another, but contemporary, hand. M. de Châte, as we know, was Mme de Villedieu's last husband. Morissette also quotes Vertron,³ who referred to Mlle Desjardins as a deceased member of the Ricovrati, and alludes to an article by the writer of this present note,⁴ who gave, without documentary evidence, March 15, 1688, as the date of reception of Mme Deshoulières into the Ricovrati. In the face of puzzling inconsistencies of names and dates, Morissette is unable to draw conclusions.

¹ *The Life and Works of Marie-Catherine Desjardins (Mme de Villedieu) 1632-1683*, Saint Louis, 1947, p. 20 and n. 70.

² Emile Magne, *Madame de Villedieu (Hortense Des Jardins) 1632-1692*, Paris, 1907, pp. 402-4.

³ Vertron, *la Nouvelle Pandore, ou les femmes illustres du siècle de Louis-le-Grand*, Paris, 1698, 2 vol., t. II, art. *la Chate*.

⁴ *Mme Deshoulières jugée par ses contemporains (Romantic Review, Oct.-Dec., 1934, p. 371).*

Other evidence can be produced, which throws light on the question, if it does not solve it. In the first place, the date of Mme Deshoulières's election is determined by Vertron. He reproduces in Italian (t. 1, pp. 175-6) her letters patent, dated March 15, 1688, that is, five years after Mme de Villedieu's death. "Notre illustre Corrine," as Vertron dubbed her, was also honored by membership in the Academy of Arles, the oldest and most important of the French provincial academies, the only one to have right to the title of *royale* and the only one considered as a daughter of the French Academy. In their letters patent to her, dated May 28, 1689,⁵ the Academy of Arles confessed that by making her the first woman academician in France, they were following the example of the Italian academies. Guyonnet de Vertron, historiographer of the king, was well informed on matters pertaining to this body, since he himself had been one of its members since 1680⁶ and had indeed very early been made its *chancelier perpetuel*.⁷ Also we learn that as early as 1681, Vertron was interested in the material which was to make up his *Nouvelle Pandore* seventeen years later. In January of that year he proposed to give a discourse before the Academy of Arles, "où il montrera la supériorité des dames."⁸ When we discover that he himself was a member of the Ricovrati, having been elected in 1688,⁹ his testimony in regard to "feue Mme de Villedieu" seems convincing.

Yet the entry by the Ricovrati secretary is false both as to names and to date, indicating that it was probably made very late; furthermore, one of the other two names on the list is erroneous: Anna Le Ferme (for Febvre) d'Acier. That the records were imperfectly kept we know, as the secretary in 1906 was unable to find any letters patent or letters of acceptance, though Mme Deshoulières's letters patent did exist. If Vertron got his information from this secretary, which he used fifteen years later, it has little weight. As Mme de Villedieu was scarcely known in the literary world by the name of Mme de Châte, I wonder whether the Italian secretary confused her with Mlle Lhéritier, whose complete name is Lhéritier de Villandon, Villandon and Villedieu offering great resemblances. The

⁵ Reproduced by Vertron, *op. cit.*, 1, 176-9.

⁶ See *Mercure galant*, mai 1680, pp. 266-271; also by author of this article, *Information Furnished by the Mercure galant on the French Provincial Academies in the Seventeenth Century* (*PMLA*, June, 1935, pp. 445-6, 461).

⁷ *Mercure*, avril 1681, pp. 212-221.

⁸ *Mercure*, jan. 1681, pp. 220-230.

⁹ *Mercure*, juillet 1688, p. 244.

noted author of *l'Adroite princesse* was elected to the Ricovrati in 1698.¹⁰ After twice receiving the prize for "bouts-rimés" of the Academy of the Lanternistes in Toulouse, she was elected to their membership also, the only French woman thus honored since Mme Deshoulières at Arles.¹¹ The *Mercure* of August, 1685 (pp. 296-301) announces the election to the Ricovrati of Saint-Aignan, protector of Arles, member of the French Academy, and associated also with the Academies of Soisson and Angers, forming yet another link between Arles and the Ricovrati. His election, three years after Mme de Villedieu's death, is the earliest which has come to my attention.

I have found no other mention of Mme de Villedieu in connection with the Ricovrati. In the February issue of the *Mercure* of 1694 (pp. 188-9), Magnin, of the Academy of Arles, who brightened up many pages of the *Mercure* with his facile poetry, furnished *devises* for the then living French women members of the Ricovrati: Mlle de Scudéry, Mme Dacier, Mme de Saliez (or Saliés) Viguière of Albi,¹² Mme Deshoulières. The *Mercure* of June, 1698 (pp. 90-1), announcing Mlle Lhéritier's election, mentioned also "feue l'admirable Madame des Houlieres," "l'incomparable Mlle de Scudéry," and "quelques Dames savantes du siècle." If the equally "admirable" and "incomparable" Mme de Villedieu had been a member, was she not worthy of mention in the *Mercure's* pages? Unfortunately the complete files of the *Mercure galant* are not available in this country; a perusal month by month with this question in mind, might solve the problem definitely, or at least offer negative evidence. At any rate, it is interesting to note the frequent links between Italian and French people and societies and particularly to remark the interchange between the Ricovrati and the outstanding French provincial academy.

MARY ELIZABETH STORER

Beloit College

¹⁰ *Mercure*, juin 1698, p. 91; also, *Journal des savans*, déc. 1734, p. 833, and *Dossiers bleus*, 394, of the Dépt. des manuscrits, Bibliothèque Nationale, art. *Lhéritier*, no. 3, dated mars 1734. These last 2 put her election in 1697, probably erroneously.

¹¹ *Histoire des Ouvrages des Savans*, nov. 1696, pp. 130-1.

¹² We find this poet-novelist also associated with the Academy of Arles, where she competed for a prize (a portrait of Louis XIV) and received second place for her poem. (*Mercure*, sept. 1685, pp. 240-4).

REVIEWS

Hispano-Arabic Poetry and Its Relations with the Old Provençal Troubadours. By A. R. NYKL. Baltimore: J. H. Furst Co., 1946. Pp. xxvii + 416. \$10.00.

Most Spanish scholars in their ignorance of Arabic can only possess one half of the soul of Spain, the country in which East and West have met, the vital slumber of the East, the restless energy of the West. The author says: "The present book is a brief condensation of my studies, in an attempt to present, for the first time in English, the whole field of the Hispano-Arabic poetry in a comprehensive form, together with an objective discussion of the contacts between the Hispano-Arabic love poetry and that of the first Aquitanian troubadours." The book would not have been possible without the ampler and more careful edition of Arabic texts during recent years and for many of these Dr Nykl is himself responsible. He deplores the fact that in the twentieth century "social and economic struggles of the gasoline era have brought about a good deal of confusion and dilettantism, fanciful interpretations and distortions tinged with curious ideologies, empty rhetoric and speculations devoid of sound knowledge."

This book of four hundred closely packed pages is the result of profound learning, and much painful research, but, as is always the case when the author's learning is complete, the way is made clear and easy for the reader, who is led lightly through the maze of historical and literary influences. A sensitive love of poetry adds to the charm, and the numerous translations are the work of a poet. The historical sketch with which the book opens bristles with what to those who do not know Arabic must seem outlandish names (often a single name occupies a whole line or more of print); yet it is crowded with vivid detail and retains a fresh and human interest throughout. Thus we read of "the blonde and blue-eyed but elderly Basque lady" whom Ibn Abī 'Āmir loved, and of 'Abd-ar-Rahmān who "was entirely given to pleasures and preferred wine to prayer." These incidental revelations are the privilege of great learning and remind one of the concrete and familiar touches that enliven the treatises of the mystics.

With a copious accompaniment of poems translated with sympathetic intimacy into rhythmic prose, we have here the biographies of two hundred Arab poets of Spain, some universally celebrated, others less well known or introduced here for the first time: the witty Al-Gazāl (pages 24-27), brilliant Ibn-Hāni (28-30), whose poetry "would deserve an exhaustive study"; Ibn-Hazm, "more famous as a philosopher of religion than as poet and statesman"

(73-103); Ibn Zaidūn, "representative of the purest traditional Classical Arab style" (106-121); King Al-Mu'tađid, who combined pleasure with ambition and "withstood the burning of the candle at both ends until the age of fifty-seven lunar years" (129-133); his son Al-Mu'tamid, the boy governor of Silves, "the most outstanding representative of the Arab-Andalusian poets of the second half of the XIth century," who would rather be a camel-driver in Morocco than a swineherd in Castille (134-154); Ibn 'Ammār, a poet of genius but a perfidious statesman, who met his death at the hands of Al-Mu'tamid when the latter, in a sudden fury, "seized an axe, given to him by Alfonso VI as a present and killed his former friend by repeated blows" (154-163); Ibn Quzmān, "the most conspicuous exponent of the art of composing *zagals* in the spoken Arabic of Al-Andalus" (266-301); Abū Ğa'far, "the most original poet of this (the Almohad) period" (317-324); the Granadine Ibn Zamrak (Zemrek, Zomrok or Zumruk), a poet with "a great artistry of words and polished expressions" (366-368).

"Nothing," says Dr Nykl, "can destroy the indelible mark of Hispano-Arabic poetry on the soul of Spain, especially southern Spain, so long as Spain remains herself, proud and not enslaved by her enemies and false friends." The characteristics of this poetry are not easier to analyze than those of any other poetry. Alternately light and profound, "at times subtle like air and at times compact like a rock," it is by turns romantic and satirical, ingenious and commonplace; its themes may be those of war or religion, a comfortable Epicureanism or a fatalistic Stoicism. These poets of Cordoba (with its half a million inhabitants, three thousand mosques, one hundred and thirteen thousand houses, three hundred bath-houses and twenty-eight suburbs), Seville, Granada, Murcia, Badajoz, Valencia, and other Andalusian cities lament the passing swiftness of life or the sorrows and passion of love (but with little of the self-pity to be found in the poets of the Greek Anthology); they show a pride in cities and a love of Nature (excluding its wilder glories), but are not afraid of humble subjects such as a bookbinding or a candle (*sujet de genre*); they can be guilty of the high-flown phrase and the familiar play on words and can combine Oriental, Biblical imagery and the gnomic wisdom of the East.

Scholars will turn with especial interest to the discussion of the elegy of Valencia (pages 303-308) and to the essential chapter VII: "Relations between the Hispano-Arabic poetry and that of the first Aquitanian troubadours." Dr Nykl is a firm believer in the influence of the Muslim poetry on the medieval poetry of the Peninsula. The Mediterranean was itself a connecting link. If on its shores the shy Iberian could mingle with Phoenician and Greek, why should this linking path, as Dr Nykl calls it, not likewise bring together Muslim and Provençal? There was of course a close connection between the Provençal poetry and that of the Galician-Portuguese *Cancioneros*, in which the very word *saúdade* is derived

from the Arabic *saudāwi* (a different meaning from that of *huzn*, the word for 'sadness') : it has nothing to do with Latin "salus" or "solitudo"; the derivative form must be *soidade*, just as *sotar* came from "saltare" and *oir* from "audire." "The harsh Poitevin dialect," writes Dr Nykl, "could hardly have appealed to people whose character pulled them toward the South," but "Undoubtedly there existed forms of popular poetry since the days of the cave-dwellers of Altamira and Aurignac, of which something may still linger in the Basque Provinces." The efforts of the Basque improvisers may be very spirited and interesting but are almost always lacking in any poetical quality and that not from decadence but owing to a natural poetical incapacity of the race. On the other hand in Provence "too much learning replaced the freshness of feeling and the novelty of joyful melodies. Old Provençal poetry gradually died of excessive codification and *trobar clus*." Over-elaboration and esotericism are the bane of highly 'cultured' societies. The influence of Muslim poetry has been denied on the ground that Christians would not understand or imitate the ways of their deadly enemies, but, as Dr Nykl remarks, "no more efficient practice has ever been devised than to combat the enemy with his own weapons and methods." It may be doubted, however, whether the truer reason of influence was not the remarkable toleration which prevailed in the Middle Ages, a toleration unknown to the modern world.

The Greeks were often the common ancestors of the Provençal and Arabic poets, but it was in music that these poetries discovered their kinship. "My experience," says Dr Nykl, "is that, especially in lyric poetry, melody comes invariably first, even in cases when the composition does not begin with putting down notes in the well-known Beethoven fashion." The motion of rowing or threshing or rocking a cradle or leaping to keep off the cold was undoubtedly the origin of the metre of the earliest popular lyrics. Undoubtedly, also, the origin of the fascinating parallelistic lyrics of the Galician-Portuguese medieval song-books was liturgical, the rhythm of them came out to the market-places from the churches, and thus were combined the two indispensable conditions of great literature, the popular and the religious element, soil and soul. It is equally clear, of course, that the parallelistic rhythm was of Biblical and therefore Oriental derivation. Dr Nykl quotes examples of the Galician-Portuguese poetry from the "Cancioneiro da Ajuda," which excludes the parallelistic lyrics, but he is willing to accept the common liturgical origin: "I should not be averse from the belief that the first training of the Troubadours was dependent on Church music, hence, as Beck suggests, on the Gregorian chant. But, after all, Christianity is an Oriental, Graeco-Hebrew product and Church music came to Aquitania also from the East."

AUBREY F. G. BELL

Victoria, B. C.

The Life and Works of Marie-Catherine Desjardins (Mme de Villedieu) 1632-1683. By BRUCE ARCHER MORRISSETTE. Saint Louis: Washington University Studies, 1947. Pp. xi + 210.

This scholarly study shows its author to be an expert research worker, and, in spite of copious footnotes and the erudite tone, is lively and very readable. The physical aspect of the book, which contains a minimum of typographical errors,¹ is pleasing. While recognizing a heavy debt to H. Carrington Lancaster in the treatment of Mme de Villedieu's three plays, and to Emile Magne, that expert in the "chasse à l'inédit," for rich bibliographical information, Morrissette is the first to attempt to assign a definitive place to Mme de Villedieu in French literary history. Diligent research has enabled him to correct some errors in Magne's *Madame de Villedieu*;² furthermore, his chief emphasis is on her works, while the latter was interested in reconstructing her life. In regard to her life, Morrissette rectifies the date of her death, and raises several questions which he is unable to solve. In some cases, as in the question of her membership in the Italian Academy of the Ricovrati (p. 20), further investigation could be made.³

The importance of Mme de Villedieu in the development of the historical novel is clearly defined, although it may be a dangerous generalization to note (p. 92) that only two precursors (Rosset and the sieur de Grenaille) may be found for the novel or the *nouvelle* based on history or on contemporary events. (See abundant examples in Jean-Pierre Camus, who, as an ecclesiast, justified his writ-

¹ The following have come to my attention: p. 13, n. 50, *Ces commissions sont aisée (aisées)*; p. 20, l. 1, *Real Academia* (for *Reale Accademia*); p. 20, l. 15, *spora* (for *sopra*); p. 38, l. 6, *evoit* (*avoit*); p. 58, l. 17, *un (une) seule parole*; p. 75, n. 31, *amitié (amitié)*; p. 83, n. 3, *Magne . . . p. 415 (414)*; p. 92, l. 18, *autants (autant)*; p. 92, n. 25, *que (qui) se rencontrent*; p. 123, l. 24, *his (her) innocence*; p. 126, l. 18, *hospitalité (hospitalité)*; p. 143, l. 32, *a (à)son retour*. The *Recueil* mentioned on p. 124, l. 6 is the *Nouveau Recueil de quelques vers*, chez Ribou. There is the minor matter of capitalization: best usage requires small letters for titles of nobility (*duc*, etc.) and capitals for *Le* or *La* as part of a proper name (*abbé de La Porte*, *Mlle de La Roche*, etc.).

² Relying on Loret, *Lettre du 6 octobre 1666*, Morrissette notes an error on the part of Magne regarding the date of death of Saint-Aignan's son, but Magne quotes an equally reliable source, Fr. Colletet, *la Muse coquette*, 1665. As Mme de Villedieu spoke of two sons dead in her *Elégie sur la mort de M. le Comte de Sery*, I presume that Colletet and Loret spoke of two different deaths, the second son having assumed the title of "comte de Sery" after the death of the eldest. Mme de Villedieu spoke of a third son still living, whom they will guide "vers l'immortalité."

³ Confusing testimony seems to be given regarding M. de Villedieu's relations with Marie-Catherine. On p. 7, one reads that "they were separated from time to time before Villedieu's death," and on p. 9 that a "semi-permanent separation took place sometime in 1664," and that Villedieu died in 1667, or shortly thereafter. However, on p. 8, n. 26, is found a reference to Ravaission, editor of the *Archives de la Bastille*, who gives the year of his death as 1669.

ing of novels because they were actually true stories of real people.) In the discussion of her *Annales galantes*, direct proof of her use of historical sources is given for the first time. A clear résumé of the question of the *aveu* in the *Désordres de l'amour* and in *la Princesse de Clèves* leads to no conclusion, but more important than that question is the demonstration that, far from being a startlingly new production, *la Princesse de Clèves* is in reality the culmination of many tendencies and that it may well owe a "sizable debt" to *les Désordres* (p. 112). What Mme de Villedieu owes to the *précieux* novel is found to be a matter of style and technique rather than of specific borrowings. Traces of realism are found in her best productions, with a trend away from the *précieux* to that psychology of love which was to constitute her most valuable contribution to the novel. (See especially *le Journal amoureux*, *les Annales galantes*, and *les Désordres de l'amour*.) The legend that the *Mémoires de la vie de Henriette-Sylvie de Molière* are autobiographical is successfully exploded. A good summary of her contribution to the *nouvelles de mœurs* is given (p. 138). Morrissette is tireless in comparing and contrasting his author with her contemporaries in the same field, thus "placing" her in her period, but years of concentrated study have not led him to attach undue importance to her as a writer.

As one of the most delicate problems with which one has to deal in the case of secondary XVIIth century writers is that of authorship, one would wish a more convincing demonstration of the unauthenticity of 6 or 7 works which have frequently been attributed to Mme de Villedieu (cf. pp. 16, 58, 65, 115). For example (p. 126, n. 30) the "contemporary" evidence that Vaumorière was the author of *le Comte de Dunois* (*Journal des savans*, 17 déc. 1703) came 32 years after its publication, which is ample time for error. *Astérie, ou Tamerlan* and *le Journal amoureux d'Espagne* are listed by Morrissette as two works (p. 115), but as one by Magne (p. 418).

The second most troublesome question is that of number and dates of editions. While Morrissette corrects certain errors of Magne, he frequently creates new ones or lacks completeness and occasionally misinterprets Magne. As the question is too lengthy to discuss here, one example will suffice. Among the editions of *les Amours des grands hommes* (p. 161) copied from Magne's bibliography, is given a second Barbin edition in Paris, 1671, but Magne really lists an Elzévierien *contrefaçon* "Sur la copie à Paris chez Cl. Barbin, 1671." It would have been useful to list the works of Mme de Villedieu which are available in libraries of this country.

One who has wandered through the maze of Mme de Villedieu's plots, cannot fail to admire the clarity and sprightliness of Morrissette's résumés, which are a valuable part of this work for the casual reader, and one is not surprised if he occasionally makes an error.⁴

⁴ On p. 94, Morrissette thus summarizes Part v, 1, of *les Annales galantes*:

Among very minor matters, one is surprised to find *jadis* and *certain* (p. 33) listed as archaic; Morissette does not see in the fables either of Mme de Villedieu or of La Fontaine "disguised pieces of social criticism"; n. 4, p. 139, on the letter of Le Pays anticipates the reference on p. 140. Is not the *Jardin des Simples* (p. 135) the *Jardin du Roi* of the XVIIth century, which was originally a garden of medicinal herbs, now the *Jardin des plantes*? A carrousel of the king in 1662 (p. 6) is the famous carrousel immortalized for the populace by the Place du carrousel of the Louvre and for the bibliophile by Charles Perrault's sumptuously illustrated *Courses de testes et de bagues* (1670). Finally it seems idle to compare the use of the word *journal* (p. 84) in the *Journal des savans* and in Mme de Villedieu's *Journal amoureux*.

However, these small inadvertencies scarcely detract from this most scholarly contribution to the study of a writer who had a hand in shaping an important, though secondary, literary *genre* of the XVIIth century.

MARY ELIZABETH STORER

Beloit College

The Well Wrought Urn. Studies in the Structure of Poetry. By CLEANTH BROOKS. New York: Reynal and Hitchcock, 1947. 270 pages. \$3.50.

This book practices literary criticism in its purest form: it scrutinizes individual works of art and strenuously excludes irrelevancies. It minimizes (naturally, it does not completely rule out) the importance of biography, historical scholarship, morality, and society, in order to concentrate on the finished work of art. To avoid critical relativism, it proceeds to apply certain general principles: that poetry speaks the language of paradox and irony; that since a poem objectifies a complex situation, its most natural form is dramatic; that form and content are basically inseparable and that paraphrase is consequently heretical; that the most fruitful discussion of a poem lies in the close analysis of its structure; and that metaphysically the structure of a good poem is a pattern of resolutions, balances and harmonizations, dramatically or symbolically presented.

Jean Le Beau, emperor of Greece, has married a princess to whom he had made passionate love, and then becomes indifferent to her. The real plot: Emanuel, son of emperor Calot-Jean of Greece, becomes indifferent to his fiancée, the Infanta. When his father courts her, Emanuel's love is rekindled and hers for him revives when the father casts the son in prison and marries her by force. Emanuel kills his father on the throne, thus "donnant le coup funeste à la ruine de ce florissant Empire" (p. 287). Here, as is usual with Mme de Villedieu, a political crisis depends on a love intrigue. The summaries of Part VI, 1 (which according to its author marks the beginning of the divisions in the kingdom of Castille) and of Part VII, 2 are incorrect and incomplete.

These assumptions are clear and sharp. Applied to well-known poems by Donne, Shakespeare, Milton, Herrick, Pope, Gray, Wordsworth, Keats, Tennyson, and Yeats, they prove more than unrooted theories: they work. The analyses accomplish what we hope from all good criticism: they deepen our understanding and increase our delight in that infinitely and delicately complex creation, an individual poem. All lovers of poetry owe a debt to Mr. Brooks and to the whole group of skilful critics since the time of Eliot and Richards for affording the world of literature more light.

Since I am grateful to Mr. Brooks for stating his principles so clearly and sharply, and even more grateful to him for taking them out of the realm of aesthetics and putting them into useful play, there is little left to be done in a short review except to raise one or two questions concerning the principles themselves. Grant them, and the practice is impeccable.

The most serious question springs from Mr. Brooks's answer to his statement: "If the Humanities are to endure, they must . . . [accept] the burden of making normative judgments." Agreed. But what makes these normative judgments acceptable? An academy? A religious or political creed? A scientific approach? None of these satisfies either Mr. Brooks or myself. Yet his solution is to work toward universal judgments based on a metaphysical answer regarding the nature of poetry. "A poem . . . is to be judged . . . by its character as drama—by its coherence, sensitivity, depth, richness, and tough-mindedness." Such a pronouncement may neatén pure literary criticism. I do not think the solution will save the humanities: it is too much occupied with establishing an invariable esthetic pattern. And as for the other half of the sentence, "A poem is to be judged, not by the truth or falsity as such, of the idea which it incorporates"—it seems to me desperate. The humanities will not endure if they are limited to the pure and distinctive mode of art. How does Mr. Brooks test, for instance, the "depth" of a poem if not by moral values based on human experience? In establishing norms, then, I would differ from Mr. Brooks in giving greater emphasis to moral truth, to tradition and past cultures (in criticism and taste), and to a poet's life—which most significantly means his other literary productions—as necessary parts of our estimate of a poem, even if it is to be understood *tout pur*.

Is not Mr. Brooks's conception of a poem as a symbolic dramatic structure too limited to pass as a universal judgment that will be fair to *all* poems? (And a judgment does imply justice.) He pleads for a formal Platonic pattern which will allow us "to approach a poem by Donne in the same general terms through which we approach a poem by Keats." This is the persuasive wording of a clever counsel-for-the-defense; for actually what he does, for eight out of his ten poets, is best described in another sentence: "The intervening poems were to be read as one has learned to read Donne and the moderns." Donne and Yeats, therefore, furnish the approach

to Gray and Tennyson. Either the norm is not sufficiently universal; or, quite flatly, the ages which did not respond to Donne were incapable of producing good poetry.

It is at least arguable that sympathy will enable a reader to approach understanding even more closely than a universal rule, no matter how comprehensively it is framed. More power may be given to "Westminster Bridge" by closely reading *The Prelude* than by finding in it some of the dominant traits of Donne's "Canonization." And, at least in the instances of the poems by Wordsworth, Yeats, and Tennyson, a greater depth of meaning would be possible in the poems themselves if Mr. Brooks had allowed himself to consider the individuals who wrote the poems.

Mr. Brooks's method, in less skilful hands, always runs the risk of making the game of analysis the final reward.¹ This is not a criticism of this book, however, since Mr. Brooks through I. A. Richards understands Coleridgean "organic form"; it is a rueful prediction that followers of Mr. Brooks may take the joy of poetry away from the people in favor of chess games played by ingenious specialists who delight in multiplying distinctions and answering, or inventing, the Sphinx's riddles.

To use Yeats's great metaphors in his poem "Among School Children" which Mr. Brooks analyzes so successfully, the "great-rooted chestnut tree" of poetry is neither its root, its blossom, nor its bole. Yet the consideration of a poem as self-contained is an attempt to consider a separate blossom. If we are truly to appreciate any one flower, we must be conscious of the tree and the ground it grows in. "How can we know the dancer from the dance?" Mr. Brooks would have us forget the dancer.

The convincing demolition of "The Heresy of Paraphrase" should demolish also any heresy of abstraction. If it does, then form cannot be considered separately any more successfully than content, not even if the form is held to be the universal metaphysical mode of poetry. Mr. Brooks's insistence upon complexity, which depends upon his conception of poetry as drama, with its corollary emphases upon irony, paradox, and ambiguity, sometimes leads him to neglect intensity—that intensity which, we used to be told, allows a noble nature to treat with simplicity or with severity a serious subject.

¹ To take a minute example of the way in which the analytical method, disregarding history, may go wrong. In the book Mr. Brooks dissects a sentence I wrote some time ago concerning one of his papers: "Mr. Brooks is determined to find all things original, spare, and strange in any set of verses before he will accord them the name of poetry." He analyzes each of the three adjectives as if this sentence, like his ideal poem, existed in itself. Yet the impression which the sentence was intended to convey was at once more allusive and more unified than such analysis. It depended for its full meaning on something outside itself—the "original, spare, strange" of Gerard Manley Hopkins' "Pied Beauty." But perhaps Mr. Brooks will accuse me here of falling into the intentional heresy.

Mr. Brooks makes all his readers conscious of irony in everything. Perhaps the most delighting irony in this book is that the case for irony in poetry is argued with such an unironical seriousness and certainty and singleness of purpose.

A tessellation of important sentences from this book—matters well expressed and never said too often—would fill a whole review. I limit myself to four short quotations: “The unifying principle of the organization which *is* the poem is an attitude or complex of attitudes. . . . The poem . . . is a simulacrum of reality . . . by *being* an experience rather than any mere statement about experience or any mere abstraction from experience. . . . The dimension in which the poem moves is not one which excludes ideas, but one which does include attitudes. . . . A poem does not *state* ideas but rather *tests* ideas.”

In sum, Mr. Brooks's method shows what criticism at its best may do to fortify art. Applied to poets and poems whose underlying assumptions accord with Mr. Brooks's, it is wholly excellent. But there remain other forms of poetry than those that exploit the intellectually complex, dramatic, and ironic. To supplement this admirable critical study, someone should write us that much needed book on the neglected field of the lyric.

DONALD A. STAUFFER

Princeton University

Jonathan Swift in Texas: An exhibition of printed books at the University of Texas, October 19—December 31, 1945. Described by AUTREY NELL WILEY. Pp. 48. [no date—no place.]

The bicentenary of Swift's death, 19th October 1945, has been the occasion of the organization of some exhibitions, of which that at Texas University stands out as one of the best and most important, not only because it has revealed to some extent the hitherto-little-known presence there of some very rich Swift material, but also because it has given rise to the description of its exhibits by Professor A. N. Wiley, whose clever treatise *Jonathan Swift, 1667-1745*, written in a pleasantly readable style, may be enjoyed with the greatest interest and pleasure.

After an introduction in which we are told that the treasures were on view in ten large cases in the exhibit room of the Rare Book Collections, and that the material principally came from the Wrenn, Aitken, and Stark collections, and Professor R. H. Griffith's private library, we are in eight chapters presented with a faithful narrative of what the ten cases contained. All Swift's great masterpieces were there, besides a host of his smaller pamphlets, among

them several rare ones. The great merit of Professor Wiley's work is that she has not given us a catalogue in the ordinary sense of the word, nor even what the French call a "catalogue raisonné," but a connected story, covering the whole field of Swift's literary activities, ranging from his first appearance in print, in *The Supplement To the Fifth Volume Of The Athenian Gazette*, 1691, to the notice of his death, in the *Dublin Courant* of 19th Oct. 1745, containing his *Verses on the Death* by way of elegy. Another advantage is that "Swiftiana," answers to his own effusions, either by friends or enemies, are also recorded, whenever the occasion presents itself. No catalogue, in whatever shape, could have made us better acquainted with the first editions of the best works of Swift's fruitful pen, and visitors to the exhibition must have found it a clear and safe guide. Aside from a few insignificant misprints, the work is singularly free from errors.

I may be excused for selecting some items of special importance in connection with my own work for the preparation of a second edition of my *Bibliography of Swift*. There is in the first place, on page 6, a hint at the existence of two editions of *A Discourse Of The Contests and Dissensions In Athens and Rome*, 1701, which important discovery is now in course of being examined; further news about it may be expected in the near future. Pages 20, 21 and 30 reveal the presence in the Wrenn and Aitken collections of the rare Dublin reprint of *The Virtues of Sid Hamet the Magician's Rod*, 1710, of the scarce first edition of *A Letter of Thanks From My Lord W——n*, 1712, and of a copy of the second edition of *A Modest Proposal For preventing the Children, &c.*, 1730. Pages 30-32 give a comprehensive summary of the various editions of *Cadenus and Vanessa*, 1726, whose sequence remains a question awaiting solution. Pages 36-7 record a unique copy of *A Proposal For An Act of Parliament To Pay Off the Debt Of The Nation*, 1732, to be found in the Aitken collection. Page 42 mentions a copy of *A Libel On Dr. D——ny*, 1730, with not three, but only two titles on the title page. I now have record of three such copies: the Wrenn Collection, the Library of Congress, and Chapin Library. Pages 47-8 speak of two more annotated copies of the *Verses On The Death of Dr. S——*, 1739, both in the Aitken collection.

If I am not mistaken, this is Professor Wiley's first appearance in the field of Swiftian scholarship, and it is to be hoped she may not leave it after this first attempt. At any rate she may be called heartily welcome and congratulated on her success.

H. TEERINK

Arnhem (Geld.), The Netherlands

BRIEF MENTION

The Augustan Reprint Society. Series One: Essays on Wit. No. 1. SIR RICHARD BLACKMORE's *Essay upon Wit* (1716) and JOSEPH ADDISON's *Freeholder*, No. 45 (1716) With an Introduction by RICHARD C. BOYS. (Ann Arbor, 1946); No. 2. *Essay on Wit* (1748), RICHARD FLECKNOE'S *Of one that Zany's the Good Companion* and *Of a bold abusive Wit* (2d. ed., 1665), JOSEPH WARTON, *The Adventurer*, Nos. 127 and 133 (1754), *Of Wit* (*Weekly Register*, 1732) With an Introduction to the Series on Wit by EDWARD N. HOOKER (Ann Arbor, 1946). Series Two: Essays on Poetry and Language. No. 1. SAMUEL COBB's *Discourse on Criticism and of Poetry from Poems on Several Occasions* (1707) With an Introduction by LOUIS I. BREDVOLD (Ann Arbor, 1946). Series Three: Essays on the Stage. No. 1. *A Letter to A. H. Esq; Concerning the Stage* (1698) and *The Occasional Paper*: No. ix (1698) With an Introduction by H. T. SWEDENBERG, JR. (Ann Arbor, 1946).

It is a great service to have fugitive and rare items like those listed above as the first output of this welcome "Society" made available in highly convenient and inexpensive form. (Each pamphlet sells for seventy-five cents or less.) It is much to be desired that these reproductions in facsimile meet with such a demand as they deserve and such as will enable the editors to go forward rapidly. In workmanship these products of the offset process are excellent. The introductions are both illuminating and learned—though in one case the typescript contains obvious errors that should have been corrected. To this reviewer the multiplication of hardly categorical "series" seems a survival of Teutonic pedantry. Since in the long run the facsimiles must stand or fall as individual items, the separate "series" serve no valuable purpose. On the other hand, the facsimiles do serve an admirable purpose, and it is to be hoped they continue in the admirable fashion in which they have begun.

GEORGE SHERBURN

Harvard University

CORRESPONDENCE

BERNARD THE MONK: NOTA AMPLIFICATA. With Professor Hamilton's welcome "postscript"¹ to my note on Bernard the monk I find myself, naturally, in general agreement. But my footnote² on the Latin gloss which appears in some manuscripts of Chaucer's *LGW* (*Bernardus monachus non uidit omnia*) does not oppose "the opinion expressed by Skeat and by Robinson that Chaucer was merely repeating a proverb"; rather, after summarizing the opinions of recent scholars, the note merely questions the priority and the dissemination of the "proverb" and asserts: "Tatlock is undoubtedly right (*MLN* XLVI, 21) in labeling the gloss 'an adage of small currency'." Until someone finds evidence that the Latin dictum existed before Chaucer wrote *LGW* 16, Tatlock's statement will have to stand. As far as I am aware, the saying is found no earlier than the late glosses on *LGW*; its occurrences in the *Lexicon Universale* (1677) or Francis Thynne (as early as 1578) or Cowper's letter of 1792 are unfortunately too late to prove anything. Thynne's references to it may reflect little more than his familiarity with the Chaucer manuscripts. Hence my suspicion that the saying may have been of English rather than Continental origin and circulation. It would not be surprising, however, to come upon it in some Latin text antedating Chaucer. Even then, a single citation would still warrant Tatlock's assumption that it was "an adage of small currency."

ROLAND M. SMITH

The University of Illinois

¹ *MLN* 62 (March, 1947), 190 f.

² *MLN* 60 (Jan., 1946), 44, n. 29.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

Ackerman, R. W.—*Syre Gawene and the Earle of Carelyle*: an Edition. *Ann Arbor*: U. of Mich. Press, 1947. Pp. 44. \$75. (U. of Mich. Contribs. to Mod. Phil., 8.)

Amura, Luis.—G. K. Chesterton (1874-1936). *Buenos Aires*: Difusión, 1946. Pp. 31.

Arnavon, Landré, etc.—Romanciers américains contemporains [Dreiser, Steinbeck, Hemingway, etc.]. *Paris*: Didier, 1946. xiv + 327 pp. Fr. 260.

Brown, Alan Willard.—The Metaphysical Society: Victorian minds in crisis, 1869-1880. *New York*: Columbia Univ. Press, 1947. Pp. xiv + 372. \$4.50.

Costello, Sister Mary Cleophas.—Between fixity and flux: a study of the concept of poetry in the criticism of T. S. Eliot. *Washington, D. C.*: Catholic Univ. Press, 1947. Pp. x + 122.

Davis, Herbert John.—The Satire of Jonathan Swift. *New York*: Macmillan, 1947. Pp. 109. \$2.00.

Dean, L. F.—Tudor Theories of History Writing. *Ann Arbor*: U. of Michigan Press, 1947. Pp. 24. \$50. (U. of Mich. Contributions to Modern Philology, 1.)

Dupont, V.—John Galsworthy: the Dramatic Artist. *Lyons* diss., 1942. Pp. 212.

—L'Utopie et le roman utopique dans la littérature anglaise. *Lyons* diss., 1941. Pp. 835.

Granville-Barker, Harley.—Prefaces to Shakespeare. Vol. II. *Othello*, *Coriolanus*, *Julius Caesar*, *Romeo and Juliet*, *Love's Labour's Lost*. *Princeton*: Princeton U. Press, 1947. viii + 450 pp. \$5.00.

Guttman, Selma.—The foreign sources of Shakespeare's work. *New York*: Kings Crown Press. Pp. 170. \$2.75.

Holloway, Sister Marcella Marie.—The prosodic theory of Gerard Manley Hopkins. *Washington, D. C.*: Catholic Univ. Press, 1947. Pp. 121.

Kierzek, John M.—The Macmillan handbook of English. Revised edition. *New York*: Macmillan, 1947. Pp. xv + 527. \$2.00.

Killigrew, Sir William.—*Siege of Urbin*, ed. Ivan Earle Taylor. Portion of U. of Pa. diss., 1946. Pp. xxiv + 71.

Lalou, René.—Les Plus beaux poèmes anglais et américains. *Paris*: Presses universitaires de France, 1947. Pp. 271. Fr. 180.

Lefranc, Abel.—A la Découverte de Shakespeare. *Paris*: A. Michel, 1945. Pp. 598. Fr. 340.

Lemonnier, Léon.—Mark Twain. *Paris*: Fayard, 1947. Pp. 269. Fr. 120.

Litzenberg, Karl.—The Victorians and the Vikings: a Bibliographical Essay on Anglo-Norse Literary Relations. *Ann Arbor*: U. of Mich. Press, 1947. Pp. 27. \$50. (U. of Mich. Contribs. to Mod. Phil., 3.)

McClennen, Joshua.—On the meaning and Function of Allegory in the English Renaissance. *Ann Arbor*: U. of Mich. Press, 1947. Pp. 38. \$75. (U. of Mich. Contribs. to Mod. Phil., 6.)

McHugh, Sheila Joyce.—“Sir Percyvelle”: its Irish connections. *Ann Arbor, Mich.*: Edwards Bros., 1946. Pp. vii + 87.

Marckwardt, A. H.—Characterization in Chaucer's Knight's Tale. *Ann Arbor*: U. of Mich. Press, 1947. Pp. 23. \$50. (U. of Mich. Contribs. to Mod. Phil., 5.)

Mayer, Elisabeth.—Die Leistungen der modernen Technik in der Dichtung Englands und der Vereinigten Staaten. Freiburg diss., 1938. Pp. 104.

Menrad, Alois.—Der Fortschrittsgedanke G. K. Chesterton. Freiburg diss., 1939. Pp. 123.

Mignon, Elisabeth.—Crabbed age and youth: the old men and women in the Restoration comedy of manners. *Durham, N. C.*: Duke Univ. Press., 1947. Pp. viii + 194. \$2.50.

Mülhaupt, Friedrich.—Das kaufmännische und puritanische Element in den Abenteuerroman Daniel Defoe's. Freiburg diss., 1939. Pp. 71.

Price, H. T.—Foreign Influences on Middle English. *Ann Arbor*: U. of Mich. Press, 1947. Pp. 45. \$75. (U. of Mich. Contribs. to Mod. Phil., 10.)

Prior, Moody E.—The language of tragedy. *New York*: Columbia Univ. Press, 1947. Pp. x + 411. \$5.00.

Rohr-Sauer, Philipp von.—English Metrical Psalms from 1600 to 1660. Freiburg diss., 1938. Pp. 128.

Rowe, K. T.—Romantic Love and Parental Authority in Sydney's *Arcadia*. *Ann Arbor*: U. of Mich. Press, 1947. Pp. 58. \$1.00. (U. of Mich. Contribs. to Mod. Phil., 4.)

Southworth, James Granville.—The poetry of Thomas Hardy. *New York*: Columbia Univ. Press, 1947. Pp. xii + 250. \$3.00.

Taylor, Ivan Earle, ed.—An edition of Sir William Killigrew's *Siege of Urbin*. *Philadelphia*: Univ. of Penn., 1946. Pp. xxiv + 53, 55.

Thaler, Alwin.—Shakespeare and Sir Philip Sidney. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard U. Press, 1947. Pp. 100. \$2.50.

Valti, Luc.—Le dernier amour de Byron. Paris: Edit. Colbert, 1947. 256 pp. Fr. 160.

GERMAN

Arber, Agnes.—Goethe's Botany. [Chronica Botanica, Vol. 10, No. 2]. Waltham, Mass.: Chronica Botanica Co; New York: G. E. Stechert & Co., 1946. Pp. 63-124, 4 plates. \$2.00.

Forster, Leonard Wilson.—Georg Rudolf Weckherlin, zur Kenntnis seines Lebens in England. Basel: Benno Schwabe, 1944. 168 pp. (Basler Studien zur deutschen Sprache und Literatur, 2.)

Glinz, Hans.—Geschichte und Kritik der Lehre von den Satzgliedern in der deutschen Grammatik. Bern: Francke, 1947. 83 pp. Fr. s. 3.80.

Meyer, Herbert.—Untersuchungen über die Elsässische Übersetzung der *Legenda aurea*. Freiburg diss., 1939. 269 pp. litho-typed.

FRENCH

Arrou, Pierre, and Others.—Léon Bloy, fort en gueule et saint de Dieu. Montreal: Serge, 1944.

Aubigné, Th.-Agrippa d'.—Les Tragiques, éd. Pierre Emmanuel. Monaco: Eds. du Rocher, 1946. 85 pp.

Bady, René.—Le problème de la joie chez Giono et Claudel. Fribourg: Librairie de l'Université, 1943. 56 pp.

Balzac.—Les secrets de la princesse de Cadignan, éd. André Ullmann. Paris: A Saint-Jean Porte-latine, 1946. 100 pp. Fr. 1200.

Bond, O. F. (ed.).—Première Etape. Alternate Basic French Readings, Books I to v [Dumas, Maury, Hugo, Bernay]. Boston: Heath, 1947. xviii + 225 pp. \$1.92.

Bonneau, Sophie.—Le Drame lyrique d'Alexandre Blok. Paris diss., 1946. 150 pp.

— L'Univers poétique d'Alexandre Blok. Paris diss., 1946. 368 pp.

Bourgeois, André.—René Boylesve, l'homme, le peintre de la Touraine. Paris diss., 1945. 269 pp.

Brody, Clara C.—The Works of Claude Boyer. New York: King's Crown Press, 1947. iv + 167 pp. \$2.50.

Cabeen, D. C. (Genl. ed.).—A Critical Bibliography of French Literature. Vol. I. The Mediaeval Period. U. T. Holmes, Jr. (ed.). Syracuse: Syracuse U. Pres, 1947. xxvi + 256 pp.

Cormeau, Nelly.—Physiologie du roman. Brussels: Renaissance du livre, 1947. 224 pp.

Cusson, Jean.—Un réformateur de théâtre: Léon Chancerel. Montreal: Edit. Fides, 1942. 100 pp.

Daniel-Rops, Doncœur, and Others.—Péguy et la vraie France. Montreal: Serge, 1944.

Dauzat, Albert.—La Géographie linguistique. Paris: Flammarion, 1943. 226 pp.

Fellows, Kathryn.—Le mot juste. New York: Globe, 1947. 73 pp. \$7.2.

Fénelon.—Extraits choisis et présentés par Marcel Raymond. Fribourg: Librairie de Université, 1943. 143 pp.

Figueras, André.—Fernand Gregh, poète moderne. Paris: Jouve, 1946. 31 pp.

Fowlie, Wallace.—De Villon à Péguy. Grandeur de la pensée française. Préface par Henri Focillon. Montreal: L'Arbre, 1944. 181 pp.

Frey, Hugo.—Max Buchon et son œuvre. Besançon diss., 1940. 214 pp.

Galzy, Jeanne.—Vie intime d'André Chénier. Paris: Eds. de la Nouvelle France, 1947. 232 pp. Fr. 120.

Gordon, D. H., and Torrey, N. L.—The Censoring of Diderot's *Encyclopédie* and the re-established text. New York: Columbia U. Press, 1947. xii + 124 pp. \$3.00.

Guillemin, Henri.—Un homme, deux ombres. Geneva: Edit. du Milieu du Monde, 1943.

Ham, E. B.—Renart le Bestorne. Ann Arbor: U. of Mich. Press, 1947. 52 pp. \$1.00. (U. of Mich. Contrbs. to Mod. Phil., 9.)

Hamon, Jean.—Passages, poèmes, éd. Maurice Rostand. Attichy, Oise: le Sol clair, 1945. 80 pp. Fr. 72.

Henriot, Emile.—De Lamartine à Valéry. Lyons: 1947. 400 pp.

Jammes, Francis.—Poèmes. Préface de Paul Claudel. Paris: Bibliophiles franco-suisse, 1946. 199 pp. Fr. 1000.

Jasinski, René.—Histoire de la littérature française. Tome I. Paris: Boivin, 1947. xii + 638 pp.

Johansen, Svend.—Le Symbolisme. Etude sur le style des symbolistes français (tr. by Hélène Laurent-Lund). Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1945. 377 pp.

Lafayette, Mme de.—La Princesse de Clèves, éd. E. Magne. Paris: Droz, 1946. xxxv + 266 pp.

Lang, Julie Anna.—La prononciation française. Buenos Aires: Quillet, 1944. 133 pp.

Laprade, Victor de.—Psyché, éd. critique par Henri Le Maître. Paris diss., 1940. lii + 256 pp.

Le Maître, Henri.—Essai sur le Mythe de Psyché dans la littérature française. Paris diss., 1939. 391 pp.

Levy, A. R.—*L'Idéalisme de Romain Rolland*. Paris diss., 1946. 309 pp.

McKenzie, G. K.—*Revision Exercises in French Grammar*. *Sydney*: Brooks, 1946. ls. 6d.

Maistre, Xavier de.—*Voyage autour de ma chambre*, éd. Georges Eudes. *Paris*: Eds. de la vie réelle, 1946. xv + 152 pp. Fr. 3000.

Mansion, J. E.—*Shorter French and English Dictionary*. 2 parts. *New York*: Holt, 1947. viii + 685 + vi + 940 pp. \$6.50.

Mongrédién, Georges.—*La Vie littéraire au XVII^e siècle*. *Paris*: Tallandier, 1947. 450 pp. Fr. 250.

Musset.—*Poésies. Comédies et proverbes*. Ed. Jean Tournassus. 2 v. *Lyons*: Archat, 1946. Fr. 700.

Nelson, N. E.—*Peter Ramus and the Confusion of Logic, Rhetoric, and Poetry*. *Ann Arbor*: U. of Mich. Press, 1947. 22 pp. \$.50. (U. of Mich. Contribs. to Mod. Phil., 2.)

Nerval, Gérard de.—*Les Chimères*, éd. Y. G. Le Dantec. *Paris*: Librairie de Médicis, 1947. 67 pp.

Orléans, Charles d'.—*La Fleur des rondeaux*, éd. Jacques Mégret. *Paris*: Jonquieres, 1942. 63 pp.

Panet, Edmond.—*Le Poète Edmond Panet, son œuvre théâtrale, poétique et théosophique*. *Pierrefitte, Seine*: L'auteur, 23, Av. Gabriel-Péri, 1946. 35 pp.

Pell, Elsie.—*François Mauriac in Search of the Infinite*. *New York*: Philosophical Library, 1947. 93 pp. \$2.75.

Prévost, Jean.—*Essai sur les sources de Lamiel; les Amazones de Stendhal; le Procès de Lacenaire*. Thèse compl. Lyons, 1942. 45 pp.

Quéru, Hermann.—*Le Dernier grand scientifique: Jules Barbey d'Aurevilly*. *Paris*: Eds. de Flore, 1946. 285 pp.

Racine.—*Iphigénie*, éd. Marcel Dupuis. *Paris*: Eds. Diderot, 1946. 95 pp. Fr. 24.

—*Mithridate*, éd. Marcel Dupuis. *Ibid.*, 1946. 96 pp. Fr. 24.

Romains, Jules.—*Actualité de Victor Hugo*. Mexico: Librairie Française.

Scherer, Jacques.—*L'expression littéraire dans l'œuvre de Mallarmé*. *Paris*: Droz, 1947. 300 pp. Fr. 500.

Shields, W. S.—*Parlons français*. *Boston*: Houghton Mifflin, 1947. xvi + 208 pp. \$1.75.

Souchon, Paul.—*Vauvenargues*. *Paris*: Tallandier, 1947. 253 pp.

Stendhal.—*La Chartreuse de Parme*, éd. Henri Martineau. *Paris*: F. Hazan, 1946. 645 pp. Fr. 250.

Trannoy, André.—*Le Romantisme politique de Montalembert avant 1843*. Paris diss., 1942. 624 pp.

Tuzet, Hélène.—*Voyageurs français en Sicile au temps du romantisme (1802-48)*. Paris diss. (1944). 502 pp.

Vaumas, M. de.—*L'éveil missionnaire de la France (d'Henri IV à la fondation du Séminaire des Missions Etrangères)*. Lyons diss., 1942. 454 pp.

—*Lettres et documents du père Joseph de Paris concernant les Missions Etrangères (1619-38)*. Lyons diss., 1942. 270 pp.

Walpole, Ronald N.—*Philip Mouskés and the Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle*. *Berkeley*: U. of Cal. Press, 1947. 116 pp. (U. of Cal. Pub. 26, no. 4.)

Walter, Gérard.—*André Chénier et son temps*. *Paris*: Laffont, 1947. 360 pp. Fr. 220.

ITALIAN

Boza Masvidal, Aurelio.—*Historia de la literatura italiana*. Vol. I. *Havana*: Selecta, 1946. 590 pp.

Butler, K. T. B., and Barbara Reynolds.—*Tredici novelle moderne*. *London*: Cambridge U. Press, 1947. x + 108 pp. 6 s.

D'Annunzio.—*Gabriel D'Annunzio à Georges Hérelle, correspondance accompagnée de douze sonnets cisalpins*. Ed. Guy Tosi. *Paris*: Denoël, 1946. 437 pp. Fr. 250.

Leopardi, Giacomo.—*I Canti*. Introd. e note di E. Chiorboli. *Bologna*: Zanichelli, 1945. 175 pp. L. 240.

Masseron, Alexandre.—*Dante Alighieri, le grand poète qui tant aimait saint François*. *Paris*: Eds. franciscaines, 1946. 103 pp. Fr. 42.

Petrarca, F.—*Rerum memorandum libri*. Ed. critica a cura di G. Billanovich. *Firenze*: Sansoni, 1945. exliii + 312 pp. L. 850.

Pontano, G.—*I Dialoghi*. Ed. critica a cura di C. Previtera. *Firenze*: Sansoni, 1945. lxvii + 352 pp. L. 200.

Russo, L.—*Studi sul Due e Trecento*. *Roma*: Edizioni Italiane S. A., 1946. 240 pp. L. 290.

SPANISH

Agostini de Del Rio, Amelia, and E. H. Hespelt.—*Lecturas hispánicas*. *New York*: Dryden Press, 1946. viii + 248 pp. \$1.80.

Alonso, Dámaso.—*Ensayos sobre poesía española*. *Buenos Aires*: Revista de Occidente Argentina [New York: Macmillan]. 403 pp. \$2.60.

Alonso Garrote, Santiago.—*El dialecto vulgar leonés hablado en Maragatería y tierra de Astorga*. *Madrid*: Inst. de Nebrija, 1947. 351 pp.

Ayala, Francisco.—*Histrionismo y Repré-*

sentación. Ejemplos y pretextos. *Buenos Aires*: Edit. Sudamericana, 1944. 241 pp.

Azorín.—El Artista y El Estilo. Ensayos colecciónados . . . por Angel Cruz Rueda. *Madrid*: Aguilar, 1946. 524 pp.

Bloise Campoy, Pascual.—Diccionario de la Rima, precedido de un Tratado de Versificación. *Madrid*: Aguilar, 1946. exxvi + 1389 pp.

Borges, J. L.—Antología de la Literatura Fantástica. *Buenos Aires*: Edit. Sudamericana. 328 pp.

Casona, Alejandro.—Nuestra Natacha, ed. W. H. Shoemaker. *New York*: Appleton-Century, 1947. xxxvi + 178 pp. \$1.50.

Castillo Solórzano, Alonso de.—Lisardo enamorado, ed. Eduardo Juliá y Martínez. *Madrid*: Real Acad. Españoila, 1947. 331 pp.

Dupuy, D. H.—El mundo del futuro. *Mountain View, Cal.*: Pacific, 1947. 448 pp. \$5.00.

Estébanez Calderón, Serafín.—Escenas andaluzas, ed. F. Salvá Miguel. *Barcelona*: Montaner y Simón, 1945. 305 pp.

Flores, Angel, and Alberto Vázquez.—Paisaje y hombres de América. *New York*: Dryden Press, 1947. xvi + 82 pp. \$2.25.

Fullona, Luis.—El Poeta Ausias March. Su ilustre ascendencia, su vida y sus escritos. *Velencia*: Torres, 1945. 272 pp.

Galdós.—La batalla de los Arapiles, ed. María Teresa León. *Buenos Aires*: Edit. Pleamar, 1946. 425 pp.

—Cádiz, ed. Rafael Alberti. *Ibid.*, 1946. 372 pp.

—Juan Martín, el Empecinado, ed. Lorenzo Varela. *Ibid.*, 1946. 302 pp.

García-Prada, Carlos, and W. E. Wilson.—Lecciones hispano-americanas. *Boston*: Heath, 1947. xii + 209 pp. \$1.60.

Garcilaso de la Vega.—Las Eglogas, ed. J. Rubio y Balaguer. *Barcelona*: Amphión, 1945. xiii + 153 pp.

González Ruiz, Nicolás (ed.).—Piezas maestras de Teatro teológico español. *Madrid*: Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, 1946. xlvi + 924 pp.

Goytortúa, Jesús.—Pensativa, ed. D. D. Walsh. *New York*: Crofts, 1947. xiv + 202 pp. \$1.65.

Ibarra, Francisco.—This is Hispano-America: Customs, Language. *New York*: Acad. of Langs., 1946. vi + 98 pp. \$1.00.

Kaulfers, W. V.—Guía al español. *New York*: Holt, 1947. viii + 832 pp. \$3.00.

—Modern Spanish Teaching. *Ibid.*, 1947. v + 99 pp.

Lincoln, J. N.—Saint Ursula, the Infanta Isabel, and Lope de Vega. *Ann Arbor*: U.

of Mich. Press, 1947. Pp. 17. \$.50. (U. of Mich. Contribs. to Mod. Phil., 7.)

Nunn, M. E., and H. Van Scy.—Viaje a Cuba. *New York*: Ronald, 1947. vii + 85 + 11 pp. \$1.25.

Peers, E. A.—Fool of Love; the Life of Ramon Lull. *Toronto*: Macmillan, 1946. 127 pp. \$1.65.

Quevedo.—Epistolario completo, ed. critica de Luis Astrana Marín. *Madrid*: Inst. Edit. Reus, 1946. xlxi + 834 pp.

Restrepo, Félix.—Diseño de semántica general. El alma de las palabras. *Bogotá*: Voluntad, 1946. 244 pp.

Rivas, Duque de.—Obras completas, ed. Enrique Ruiz de la Serna. *Madrid*: Aguilar, 1945. cii + 1528 pp.

Turner, G. F., and Alberto Herrera.—How to Speak Spanish. *Kansas City*: Fielding Press, 1946. 11 pp. \$1.00.

Vega, Lope de.—Obras escogidas, I. Teatro, ed. F. C. Sáinz de Robles. *Madrid*: Aguilar, 1946. 1723 pp.

PORTUGUESE

Ecá, Raúl d', and E. V. Greenfield.—Outline of Portuguese Grammar. *New York*: Barnes & Noble, 1947. vi + 199 pp. \$1.25.

RUSSIAN

Callahan, L. I.—Russian-English Technical and Chemical Dictionary. *New York*: Wiley, 1947. xvii + 794 pp. \$10.00.

Ettlinger, Amrei, and J. M. Gladstone.—Russian Literature, Theatre and Art; a bibliography of works in English, 1900-45. *London*: Hutchinson, 1947. 96 pp. 7s. 6d.

GENERAL

Brauner, Heinz.—Die tschechische Lexicographie des 16. Jahrhunderts. Breslau diss., 1939. xiv + 107 pp.

Career Opportunities in Aviation.—A Handbook of Vocational Information. *Washington*: National Council of Technical Schools (1947). 31 pp. \$1.15.

Colwell, E. C.—The Publishing Needs of Scholarship. *Berkeley*: U. of Cal. Press, 1947. 11 pp.

Foreign Affairs, Background Summary.—America—"A Full and Fair Picture." No. 2. *Washington*: Department of State, 1947. 52 pp. lithographed.

Karelsen, F. E. Jr. (ed.)—Human Relations, a Challenge to Our Public Schools. *New York*: International Press, 1947. viii + 74 pp.

The Manual of Standards and Directory of Private Home Study Schools and Courses. *Washington*: The National Home Study Council, 1947. 48 pp.

. of

e a

i +

of

46.

ica

dit.

ica

tá:

ed.

ar,

ow

ing

tro,

ar,

ut-

rk:

25.

cal

ey,

a

45.

6d.

co-

ss.,

-A

sh-

cal

of

ess,

No.

47.

la-

ols.

+

ory

ies.

ddy

—
of
a
+
of
6.
ea
it.

ea
i:
d.
ar,
ow
ng
ro,
ar,

nt-
k:
25.

cal
ey,

—
a
45.
6d.

co-
ss.,

-A
sh-
ical

of
ess,

—
No.
047.

ela-
ols.
i +

tory
rses.
study

The Variorum Spenser

The Variorum Edition of Edmund Spenser, inaugurated by the late Edwin Greenlaw, under the general editorship of Edwin Greenlaw, Charles G. Osgood, Frederick M. Padelford, and Ray Heffner, has now progressed through the following volumes:

The Faerie Queene

Volume I, Book One. Special Editor, Frederick M. Padelford. 1932.
xii + 556 pages

Volume II, Book Two. Special Editor, Edwin Greenlaw. 1933. xii
+ 517 pages

Volume III, Book Three. Special Editor, Frederick M. Padelford.
1934. x + 432 pages

Volume IV, Book Four. Special Editor, Ray Heffner. 1935. xi + 357
pages

Volume V, Book Five. Special Editor, Ray Heffner. 1936. xi + 375
pages

Volume VI, Books Six and Seven. Special Editors, the general editors
and James G. McManaway, Dorothy E. Mason, and
Brents Stirling. 1938. x + 506 pages

The price of each of these six volumes is \$6 net; sold only in sets.

The Minor Poems

Volume I, *Shephearde's Calender, Daphnaida, Colin Clouts Come Home Againe, Astrophel, The Foure Hymnes*. Special Editors, Charles G. Osgood, Henry G. Lotspiech, Dorothy E. Mason. 1943. xi + 734 pages. Price, \$7.50

Volume II, verses in *A Theatre for Worldlings, Complaints, Amoretti and Epithalamion, Prothalamion*, Commendatory Sonnets, scattered poems and fragments. Special Editors, Charles G. Osgood, Henry G. Lotspiech, Dorothy E. Mason. 1947. xii + 745 pages. Price, \$8.75

The Life of Edmund Spenser. By Alexander C. Judson. 1945.
vii + 238 pages. Price, \$4.50

A volume containing the prose, under the special editorship of Rudolf B. Gottfried, is far advanced toward completion. It is hoped to conclude the Variorum Edition with a volume containing a Glossary and an Index to the whole edition.

Now ready—Book Three
Castillo, Sparkman, and Others
GRADED SPANISH READERS, ALTERNATE *

CUENTOS DEL ALTO PERÚ

*Adapted and edited by WILLIS KNAPP JONES
Miami University*

Five stories of Alto Perú in Spanish colonial times.
Although simple in style, the stories are authentic
Spanish and represent one story-teller each from
Colombia, Bolivia, Spain, Peru, and Chile. \$44

Previously published: Book One, *Cuentecitos* (Leal);
Book Two, *Periquillo* (Leal). Each \$44

* In the Heath-Chicago Spanish Series

D. C. HEATH AND COMPANY

BOSTON NEW YORK CHICAGO ATLANTA SAN FRANCISCO DALLAS LONDON

*The First Oslerian Text, published in memory of Sir William Osler,
Lady Grace Osler, and Revere Osler*

**THE ESSAYES OF SIR WILLIAM CORNWALLIS
THE YOUNGER**

EDITED WITH AN INTRODUCTION, VARIANT TABLES, AND A COMMENTARY

BY

DON CAMERON ALLEN

Professor of English Literature, The Johns Hopkins University

Though the honor of writing the first English essays is usually accorded to Francis Bacon, it is only by a stretch of the imagination, and the evidence of the subsequent editions, that this title can be conferred on the loose collections of jottings that are *The Essays* of 1597. In 1600-01, Sir William Cornwallis the Younger published over fifty essays that are clearly the true beginning of this form in England; and since Cornwallis acknowledged Montaigne as his master, one can see that he was a much more conscious essayist than was Bacon.

Pp. xxiii + 265, 1 plate. Cloth, \$4.75.

By the same editor

The OWLES ALMANACKE edited with an Introduction

Pp. vii + 103, 2 plates. Cloth, \$1.50.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS · BALTIMORE 18